

2952. By Mr. SPENCE: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Falmouth, Ky., protesting against the repeal, resubmission, or modification of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2953. By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: Petition signed by Mrs. M. J. Rulaford and 13 other adult residents, of College Place, Wash., protesting against the compulsory Sunday observance bill, S. 1202; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2954. By Mr. TARVER: Petition of Lena Mason and many other members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and other citizens of Ochlochnee, Ga., protesting against the modification or repeal of our prohibition laws and resubmission of the eighteenth amendment to the States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2955. By Mr. TURPIN: Petition of citizens of Luzerne County, Pa., protesting against the passage of Senate bill 1202 or any other compulsory Sunday observance bills; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2956. Also, petition of citizens of Hazleton, Pa., urging the maintenance of the prohibition law and its enforcement and against any measure looking toward its modification, resubmission to the States, or repeal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2957. Also, petition of citizens of Luzerne County, Pa., protesting against the passage of Senate bill 1202 or any other compulsory Sunday observance bills; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2958. Also, petition of members of Central Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., opposing the resubmission of the eighteenth amendment to the States for a vote, and requesting their representatives in the House and Senate to vote against such a resolution; and for adequate appropriations for law enforcement and for education in law observance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2959. Also, petition of citizens of Luzerne County, Pa., protesting against the passage of Senate bill 1202 or any other compulsory Sunday observance bills; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2960. By Mr. WHITE: Resolution of the council of the city of Toledo, Ohio, indorsing cooperation of the Federal Government with the several States in relieving the hardship and suffering caused by unemployment; to the Committee on Labor.

2961. By Mr. WYANT: Petition of Trafford Ministerial Association, adopted at a mass meeting of five churches, representing about 1,300 people, in Trafford, Westmoreland County, Pa., opposing resubmission of eighteenth amendment to be ratified by State conventions or by State legislatures, and urging Congressmen and Senators to vote against such resolutions, and to vote for adequate appropriations for law enforcement and for education in law observance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1932

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

The Lord God omnipotent reigneth and in His holy hands all things rest. Surely we are encompassed by Thy mercy and no good thing dost Thou withhold from us. Let us feel this day the impulse and the restraint of Thy presence. May our opportunities for public service be held as sacred trusts for Thy glory and for the peace and contentment of our whole country; impress us with a solemn sense of our responsibility. In every way may we be worthy of the very best traditions of the Republic. Enable us above all things to maintain the sanctity of Thy precepts, follow the way of Thy revealed truth, and to love Him who first loved us. Our Father, we pray Thee to hear those whose dumb entreaties are written on their hearts and whose language can not be told. For Thy name's sake. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 292) entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to aid in the establishment of agricultural credit corporations, and for other purposes."

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 100. An act to amend section 586c of the act entitled "An act to amend subchapter 1 of chapter 18 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia relating to degree-conferring institutions," approved March 2, 1929; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 207. An act for the relief of James L. Pate; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 417. An act to provide a government for American Samoa; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

S. 432. An act granting permission to Harold I. June to transfer to the Fleet Reserve of the United States Navy; and

S. 433. An act to authorize the posthumous award of a distinguished-flying cross to Eugene B. Ely; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 460. An act to give war-time commissioned rank to retired warrant officers and enlisted men; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 462. An act for the relief of certain officers of the Dental Corps of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 466. An act for the relief of the Allegheny Forging Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 480. An act for the relief of Peter C. Hains, jr.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 816. An act for the relief of E. H. Flagg; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 860. An act for the relief of William Girard Joseph Bennett; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 863. An act for the relief of Edgar Joseph Casey; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 894. An act directing the retirement of acting assistant surgeons of the United States Navy at the age of 64 years; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1047. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, to deliver to the custody of the Historical Society of Montana, for preservation and exhibition, the silver service which was in use on the gunboat, No. 9, *Helena*; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1088. An act for the relief of Cornelia Claiborne; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1096. An act for the relief of Nels D'Arcy Drake; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1205. An act for the relief of Edith Tolerton Lathrop; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1294. An act for the relief of Harry Flanery; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1529. An act for the relief of Charles Morton Wilson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1839. An act to authorize the creation of Indian trust estates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 1855. An act to provide for the care and maintenance of the Guilford Courthouse National Military Park; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2200. An act to authorize the presentation of a medal of honor, posthumously, to the late Henry Clay Drexler and the late George Robert Cholister; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 2242. An act granting six months' pay to Louis Soluri; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2426. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to convey to the State of Arizona a portion of a National Guard target range near Phoenix, Ariz., for use as a burial plot; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2496. An act to permit construction, maintenance, and use of certain pipe lines for petroleum and petroleum products in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2915. An act authorizing A. A. Lilly, M. B. Collinsworth, and A. E. Booth, their heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Big Sandy River at or near where it enters into the Ohio River, and between the cities of Kenova, W. Va., and Catlettsburg, Ky.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2982. An act for the relief of J. G. Seupelt; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 3027. An act for the relief of James J. Jordan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 3110. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to arrange with States for the education, medical attention, and relief of distress of Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 3222. An act to amend an act approved March 3, 1917, known as the District of Columbia appropriation act for the year ending June 30, 1918; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 3409. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain unused Indian cemetery reserves on the Wichita Indian Reservation in Oklahoma to provide funds for purchase of other suitable burial sites for the Wichita Indians and affiliated bands; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 3443. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to grant a right of way to the Alameda Belt Line across the Benton Field Military Reservation, Alameda, Calif.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 3514. An act regulating the use of appropriations for the military and nonmilitary activities of the War Department; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 3538. An act for the relief of Nellie McMullen; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 3547. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to acquire, exchange, transfer, and sell certain tracts of real estate, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 3634. An act to amend section 600 of the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1284; D. C. Code, title 5, sec. 122); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. J. Res. 4. Joint resolution to provide for the naming of Montgomery Blair Portal; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. J. Res. 41. Joint resolution granting consent of Congress to a compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey creating the Delaware River joint commission and specifying the powers and duties thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. J. Res. 50. Joint resolution to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to close upper Water Street between Twenty-second and Twenty-third Streets; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. J. Res. 55. Joint resolution to amend section 2 of the act of February 25, 1927 (44 Stat. L., pt. 2, p. 336); to the Committee on Claims.

S. J. Res. 110. Joint Resolution authorizing the distribution of Government-owned wheat to the American National Red Cross and other organizations for relief of distress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on February 26, 1932, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

LXXV—306

H. R. 9203. An act to improve the facilities of the Federal reserve system for the service of commerce, industry, and agriculture, to provide means for meeting the needs of member banks in exceptional circumstances, and for other purposes.

HENRY WADSWORTH LONGFELLOW

Mr. PARTRIDGE. Mr. Speaker, to-day is the one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary of the birth of the poet Henry W. Longfellow. Although born in the city of Portland, Me., he belongs to the Nation. I therefore deem it fitting that this body give some recognition of the day, and I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD two brief proclamations issued by the city council of that beautiful city by the sea. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

The proclamations are as follows:

PORTLAND'S TERCENTENARY AND CENTENNIAL, 1932

Proclamation

Whereas the year 1932 is the three hundredth anniversary of the first settlement of Portland by George Cleeves and Richard Tucker; and

Whereas on March 26, 1832, after 200 years of development, Portland was chartered as a city: Now, therefore,

It is urged that 1932 be made memorable by a fitting celebration of this most remarkable coincidence of centennial and tercentenary; and it is now

Resolved, That the citizens of Portland extend not only a general invitation to cities and towns but to organizations, individuals, and native sons and daughters the world over to join with the city of Portland, Me., in recognition and observance on any or all of the 366 days of 1932.

ARTHUR W. JORDAN,
Chairman Portland City Council, 1931.

PORTLAND, BIRTHPLACE OF LONGFELLOW, THE WORLD'S BEST-LOVED POET

Proclamation

Whereas Portland, Me., is the native city of Henry W. Longfellow, the world's best-loved poet, as well as one of the greatest names in all literature, whose beautiful life and work is a never-ending source of inspiration for young and old as one of the most perfect examples of noble living, of loving and helpful service in all human history: Now, therefore,

The people of Portland and all lovers of Longfellow everywhere are hereby urged to observe each succeeding anniversary of Longfellow's birth, February 27, as Longfellow Day, with flags and decorations, musical and other programs, in such ways and by such means as may suit their inclination and convenience.

RALPH D. BROOKS,
Chairman Portland City Council, 1930.

"AND THE MULE THAT WAS UNDER HIM WENT AWAY"

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a speech by my colleague Hon. FRANK L. BOWMAN, of West Virginia, before the United Republican Club, Clarksburg, W. Va., on the one hundred and twenty-third anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by Hon. FRANK L. BOWMAN before the United Republican Club, Clarksburg, W. Va., on the one hundred and twenty-third anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, February 12, 1932, on the subject, " * * * And the Mule That Was Under Him Went Away." II Samuel xviii, 9.

This is the one hundred and twenty-third anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln. A great Nation pays tribute to his immortal name; but no section of the United States is endowed with greater significance of honor and homage than this city—the birthplace of Stonewall Jackson. Abraham Lincoln and Stonewall Jackson represented two contending forces in the field of political thought. The one advocated the preservation of the Union; the other defended the rights of separate States to secede from the Union. The one was endowed with the noble virtues of human sympathy and kindly patience and quiet forbearance inherited from a loving mother, whose first inspirations of life came from the wooded dells and mountain sides of West Augusta. The other was characterized by those noble qualities of a fearless bravery and a rugged courage and a divine consciousness possessed by the pioneer men of the hills. In national life both demonstrated un-

swerving fidelity and devotion to their honest convictions; and each traveled the lonely and uncertain pathway to a martyr's grave. When Stonewall Jackson fell on the field of battle the Confederate States lost their most courageous defender in the times of war; when Lincoln fell by the hand of an assassin the South lost its greatest friend in the reconstruction days of peace. It is not for us to reason why. We can not interpret the motives of fate, but we do know that the lives of these two national characters exemplified and personified those rare and essential qualities of a patriotic citizenship found in the State of West Virginia—the sympathetic soul of a great statesman and the courageous heart of a brave soldier.

In 1860 Abraham Lincoln was elected president of the United States, and this date marks the birth of a great political party whose platform proclaimed to a demoralized and decadent Nation two great doctrines or principles of national moment: (1) The maintenance of the integrity of the Union and the paramount authority of the Constitution and the laws of the United States. (2) The sound economic policy of a protective tariff in order to encourage and stimulate the development of industry, to secure for American labor a high standard of wage, and to bring to this Nation commercial prosperity and economic independence. The successful termination of the Civil War preserved the integrity of the Union and restored the authority of the Constitution and the laws of the United States; and the phenomenal rise of the United States to the commercial and industrial supremacy of the world is conclusive evidence of the wisdom of a national economic policy sustained and supported by a protective tariff.

Nations can grow and develop commercially and industrially only under favorable economic conditions. Without them, nations perish and decay. Favorable economic conditions are to a nation what the fertility of the soil and proper climatic conditions are to plant life. Both the life of a nation and the life of a plant must be sustained, cultivated, stimulated, and nurtured under conditions favorable to growth and development. In national life these conditions are designated as national policies, and under our democratic form of government national policies of our Government are determined by the application of the policies and principles of the party in power. It is evident, therefore, that the rapid growth and development of the United States must be attributed to national policies conducive and favorable to the growth and development of commerce and industry, and under our 2-party system these national policies must find their sources in the declared doctrines and principles of some great political party.

The Socialist Party can not lay claim to this distinction, because it has not been in power. Since 1860 the Democratic Party has been in power only 16 years in the 72-year period, and its efforts to apply its policies and principles in national life, except during the stimulus of the World War, reversed the economic order of our Nation and ended finally in the political maelstroms of economic depressions.

On the other hand, the Republican Party has been in power in the United States for 56 years, which have witnessed, in the main, the most marvelous period of our country's prosperity and growth. The political application, therefore, in the life of the Nation, of its declared economic policies and principles must necessarily have created most favorable conditions for the growth and development of commerce and industry. There can be no other conclusion. Thus, in defending the tenets of the Republican Party and its contribution to the economic life of the Nation, we honor that brave defender of the Union, who, having preserved the Union, placed its economic destiny in the hands of the Republican Party—Abraham Lincoln.

The proof of our conclusions challenges us to a comparative study or analysis of our political history. The protagonists of Christian conduct go to the Bible for authority and parallel, and the students of political science study the lives of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln for example and precedent; but on this occasion I do not want to appear sacrilegious, neither do I want to be charged with political heresy, if I should find a political parallel from the sacred literature of ancient times. I have chosen a Biblical text for my political address, and it is found in a portion of the ninth verse of the eighteenth chapter of II Samuel in these words: " * * * and the mule that was under him went away."

David was King of Israel. It is recorded that the people were hungry and weary and thirsty in the wilderness. Absalom, the son of King David, stood by the way of the gate and kissed the hands of those who sought King David, and reviled and rebuked and condemned and criticized the King, and openly declared that if he were King justice would be done in the kingdom. Absalom was a politician. He had no reforms for Israel. He wanted to rule and reign. The day came when Absalom rebelled against King David, and in his flight before the mighty host of Israel's army through the woods of Ephraim, Absalom's head caught in the thick boughs of a mighty oak and " * * * he was taken up between the heaven and the earth; and the mule that was under him went away."

This was the tragic ending of the political career of a young man whose political philosophy was founded upon the fallacies of condemnation and abuse, and whose consuming ambition to rule and reign was inspired only by the purely selfish motives of political expediency.

This historical incident symbolizes the cruel and tragic fates of others in more recent years, who, having censured and severely condemned Republican administrations and having lifted high their unfurled banners, scrolled with empty issues of political ex-

pediency, have rebelled against the Republican Party in a desperate effort to ride the mule into political power of the Nation. Like the erring Absalom, they have been unable to ride under the strong economic boughs of Republicanism and they have been lifted up between the heaven and the earth and the mule that was under them went away.

The Democratic Party has been a party of paramount issues. Every four years bring a new paramount issue or a complete renunciation of a former paramount issue. This political vacillation has been due to the lack of a definite national program and has also accounted for its reliance upon political suitability and partisan subterfuge to attain its end or purpose.

In 1896, the Democratic Party declared that the paramount issue was the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1; and that courageous young Lochinvar of the West, William Jennings Bryan, was nominated for President. William McKinley, the Republican nominee for President, maintained that the return of the Nation to the protective policies of the Republican Party would reopen the doors of the closed factories, would stimulate trade and commerce, and would give to labor its heritage of a high wage. William McKinley was right, and his administration proved the fallacies of the free-silver plank. Like the story of old, William Jennings Bryan was lifted up between the heaven and the earth, and the mule that was under him went away.

Twice again, 1900 and 1908, William Jennings Bryan rode this Democratic mule in a futile attempt to rebel against the national doctrines and principles of the Republican Party. In 1900, the Democratic Party forsook its paramount issue of free and unlimited coinage of silver and declared that the paramount issue was "imperialism." In 1908 it was necessary for the Democratic Party to secure another paramount issue, and the platform declared that " 'Shall the people rule?' is the overwhelming issue which manifests itself in all questions now under discussion." The Democratic Party was a party of opportunism. The people would not follow.

We can visualize Miss Democracy with the mantle of David's grief for his son, Absalom, upon her shoulders, crying out, "Would to God I had died for thee, O William, my son, my son!" when she learned that twice again her eloquent son had encountered the boughs of confidence and faith in Republican principles, and the mule that was under him had gone away.

In 1904 the Democratic Party was convinced that a resurrection of the free-silver plank and the imperialism plank would not bring success at the polls, and a new plank against trusts was discovered as a paramount issue. In this convention we have a political fiasco of a great political party repudiating its platform of eight years ago. The convention had nominated Alton B. Parker and was awaiting his wire of acceptance. His acceptance was predicated on the adoption of a gold plank, and to satisfy its nominee for President it repudiated its free-silver plank of 1896. Here is a practical lesson in political expediency and political suitability—a great national convention changing its declarations on national policies to meet the mere whims and ideas of a single individual. If free silver was right in 1896, it should have been right in 1904. The feeble attempt of Mr. Parker to rally the broken ranks of a great party left no sting of regret when the mule that was under him went away.

The bitter factional controversies in the Republican Party in 1912 permitted Woodrow Wilson, the standard bearer of the Democratic Party, to ride unmolested between the hostile and contending ranks of the Republican Party to success and victory. During this administration the smoldering embers of European hatred and intrigue burst forth into a raging conflagration of war. International treaties and rights were violated. American lives were ruthlessly destroyed upon the high seas. War was inevitable; neutrality was feigned. This insincere neutrality continued throughout the campaign of 1916, when Woodrow Wilson was again nominated for President by the Democratic Party on the issue, "He kept us out of war." Already President Wilson and his close political advisers had agreed secretly that war was inevitable; but political expediency dictated the withholding of actual facts until after the election and inauguration. It is most significant that Woodrow Wilson was inaugurated March 4, 1917, and on April 6, 1917, the United States declared war against Germany.

We remember the spectacular campaign of 1920 in which the Democratic Party endeavored to commit the United States to membership in the League of Nations. The people of the United States repudiated that effort by an overwhelming vote. Twelve years later, in 1932, we find the leading candidate for the Presidency of the Democratic Party backtracking on a definite, declared policy of his party, which he, as the Democratic nominee for Vice President, advocated with great zeal and earnestness in 1920. Franklin Roosevelt now says: " * * * that he would not advocate our entrance into the league, as the league is not now what it was when he advocated our entrance." In the light of the conflict between Japan and China over the protest of the League of Nations, which claims the membership of both warring nations, it is therefore the part of political wisdom and expedience to declare that the league is not what it should be and therefore we should not enter; but, my friends, that league is to-day just what the Republican Party in 1920 predicted it would be. Who was right? The Republican Party was right in 1920 and it does not have to change its political creed or dogma to be right on this issue in 1932.

Like Absalom, the fearless rider of the mule in 1920 found himself lifted up between the heaven and the earth by the sturdy

boughts of national independence from entangling alliances with European powers, and the mule that was under him went away.

The political hysteria of the Democratic Party in choosing and changing paramount issues has been excelled only by dangerous symptoms of political amnesia concerning its declarations on the tariff. The Democratic Party was originally a free-trade party. To its everlasting credit, the party digressed from this dangerous pathway only to wander aimlessly in the fields of economic thought. It has been on all sides of the tariff question. The proof of my assertions is founded on the declarations of the various Democratic platforms.

In 1876 the Democratic platform denounced a protective tariff as a masterpiece of injustice, inequality, and robbery, as "fostering smuggling and enriching dishonest officials." The tariff plank closed with the following: "We demand that all customhouse taxation shall be for revenue only."

In 1888, at the close of Grover Cleveland's first administration and the Democratic Party's first experience in attempting to enact a tariff law consistent with its declarations and professions, the Democratic Party faced about and demanded a tariff written "with due allowance for the difference between the wages of American and foreign labor, which should promote and encourage every branch of industry and enterprise by giving them assurance of an expanded market and steady, continuous operations."

In 1904 it denounced protection as "a robbery of the many to enrich the few." In 1908 it qualified and modified its position so as to demand free trade on all articles when entered into competition with articles made in the United States by trusts, without defining a trust.

In 1912 history records a great political phenomenon. The Democratic Party completely abandoned its decided trend toward the protective features of a tariff and began its platform with the following declaration:

"We declare it to be a fundamental principle of the Democratic Party that the Federal Government under the Constitution has no right or power to impose or collect tariff duties except for the purpose of revenue."

In other words, it had taken the Democratic Party from 1860 to 1912, a period of 52 years, to discover that under our Constitution there legally can not be a protective tariff, and it embraced that theory and declared it to be a fundamental principle of the Democratic Party; but four years later, when the country was in the throes of an approaching economic depression under a Democratic tariff, which depression was stayed only by the bloody hands of the World War, the Democratic Party discovered that America could have a protective tariff, and declared: "We recognize that tariff rates are necessarily subject to change to meet changing conditions in the world's progress and trade."

Four years ago in the Democratic convention at Houston, Tex., amid the noisy acclaim and enthusiasm of Tammany, Alfred E. Smith, a favorite son of that renowned organization, was nominated for President. Into his care was intrusted that faithful mule, which despite its age still retains the fractious qualities and disposition of all mules; and into his hands were placed the standards of a great party, which he deliberately cast to the ground and substituted his own standard, thereby repudiating his own party platform and the paramount authority of the Constitution and the integrity of the laws of the United States. A few days before the election, John J. Raskob, a pseudo-Republican who had become chairman of the Democratic National Committee, saw the unmistakable signs of defeat and immediately endeavored to have each Democratic candidate for election to the House of Representatives declare himself for a competitive tariff, camouflaged as a protective tariff. History will probably never complete the interesting story of the number or the personnel of those who actually committed themselves. It was too late, however, to save Mr. Smith by any ruse of political expediency. On that fateful day in November, 1928, Alfred E. Smith, like many eminent predecessors, was lifted up between the heaven and the earth and the mule that was under him went away.

This brief, but accurate record of the Democratic tariff declarations and professions may have been uninteresting; but, my friends, upon that record hangs the economic fate of this great Nation. The enemies of the Republican Party have repeatedly declared that the protective principles of our present tariff are responsible for the present national depression. The friends of a protective tariff have asked these enemies to name the rates and schedules that are too high and should be reduced; but no voice has been raised in reply.

In this connection, I want to call your attention to the flexible provisions of the much-maligned Hawley-Smoot tariff bill. Upon petition, the United States Tariff Commission is authorized to investigate any and all of the rates and schedules of the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill and recommended either an increase or decrease in rates in accordance with petitions filed. The approval of the recommendations of the said commission by the President of the United States establishes new tariff rates. No tariff law is without its inconsistencies and irregularities, and the Congress of the United States delegated its power of correcting and adjusting rates to the Tariff Commission. It may be interesting to note that those who have endeavored to transform our economic tariff walls into "wailing walls" of dissatisfaction and distrust have not availed themselves of the flexible provisions of our tariff laws; but on the other hand the records before the Tariff Commission show that a majority of the petitions filed for reduction in tariff rates are filed by foreign manufacturers and importers of foreign goods. Every protest against our present tariff rates, without attempting to take advantage of the flexible provisions of our law, is political

hypocrisy and demagoguery; and is also an eloquent plea in defense of the petitions filed by representatives of foreign interests seeking the markets of America.

The Democratic Party has given recent utterance to a new tariff policy. It has spoken by a legislative enactment which is a faint and feeble echo of the many vehement charges against our present tariff law. The House of Representatives in the United States Congress is Democratic. That party has absolute control of every committee and every office of authority. If it believes the statements and assertions of its spokesmen that the present tariff law was responsible for our depressed economic conditions, it was the patriotic duty and privilege of that party to correct the present economic conditions and restore the country to prosperity. This plan, however, was not adopted; and the legislative action of the Democratic Party placed the seal of insincerity upon each statement of its friends in denouncing and condemning our present tariff policies. Without attempting to reduce the rates and schedules of a single article, the Democratic Party in the House of Representatives declared a new economic policy, which is found in H. R. 6662. This bill destroys the elasticity of the flexible provisions of our present tariff and commits this Nation to a permanent international economic conference. The Republican Party stands squarely against any policy of submitting our domestic problems to any international court, and certainly this great Nation should forever reserve the right of fostering our agriculture, developing our industries, and protecting our labor without the advice and consent of a single foreign country. In truth, the Democratic Party has spoken and the economic fate of a Nation hangs in a balance.

There is, however, a concerted movement on the part of many Democrats to rewrite our present tariff law. This effort will naturally result in the reduction of our present tariff rates and in the complete abandonment of our markets to foreign competition. History may repeat. During the economic depression of 1896 and 1920 the Nation was suffering from the effects of the low revenue rates and schedules of Democratic tariffs. Under these laws the Nation passed quickly from prosperity to depression, and the immediate application of the protective policies of the Republican Party completely restored prosperity to the Nation. In these campaigns the Republican Party was correct in its diagnosis and prescriptions; but to-day in this period of world-wide depression the Democratic Party pleads for and demands a tariff similar to those which produced depressions. I maintain that that which destroyed industry and robbed labor in the days of prosperity can not revive industry and restore labor in the days of adversity. That which destroys life can not resurrect the dead. It is strange, indeed, that our Democratic friends advocate identically the same remedy for the cure of the present depression that destroyed industry and labor in the days of prosperity.

In view of this record, if all the paramount issues and all the inconsistent tariff planks declared in the various Democratic platforms since 1860 were compiled and written into one platform, it would be a meaningless compendium of a political abracadabra. It would add nothing to the political life of the Nation.

On the other hand, from the platform planks of the Republican Party since 1860 you can trace the progress and the growth and the development of the greatest nation of the world. Nowhere do we find an abandonment of a single issue until it had been vitalized and incorporated into the social, political, and economic life of this country. In the services of the Republican Party to the country there has been no deviation from its policies and no defection from its economic course. It has never sacrificed national principles for party success. It has been the friend of the Nation in the days of prosperity, and it remains the true friend of the Nation in this day of adversity.

This is the day of national adversity. The economic shores of America have been lashed by a tidal wave of the most destructive world-wide catastrophe of all ages, and America has felt the force and effect of a violent repercussion of the unstable economic conditions of foreign nations. There is stagnation of business, there is unemployment, and there is much suffering and distress throughout the Nation. We can not close our eyes to these appalling conditions, and to correct and remedy them the united efforts of all individuals and parties are absolutely essential and necessary. Already the United States has been saved and relieved from the more acute affliction and the more intense suffering, misery, and distress of other countries. A comparative analysis of conditions affecting the nations of the world will substantiate this assertion, and the truth of this condition is also verified by the numerous statements of foreign representatives who are amazed at the manner in which America is meeting this world-wide crisis.

It is most pleasing and gratifying to know that America has been saved from the depths of the more disastrous and the more deplorable fate of other nations; but this favorable situation does not relieve us from the patriotic responsibility of reconstructing the economic forces of the Nation. In this effort to discharge our responsibilities there is no place for bitter denunciations, and it does not contemplate the capitalization of human misery and human suffering for mere political advantage and political expediency.

In the Capital City of your Nation there is a man who has been maligned, condemned, and criticized as no other man since the days of the immortal Abraham Lincoln; and, like Abraham Lincoln, with patience and forbearance and with a sympathetic understanding he silently endeavors to solve the great problems

"with malice toward none and charity for all." The vicious, unwarranted attacks of his political enemies have not stayed his guiding hands, neither have they dimmed his clear vision of his charted course for national economic recovery. With a resolute heart he stands undismayed and unafraid at the helm of the ship of state. He has submitted to the country the most comprehensive program of reconstruction ever submitted to this or any other nation. By this act he has confounded and confused his political enemies and has compelled admiration and praise from his friends. The issues of a restored economic life, which will lead us beyond the lowering clouds of gloom and despondency into the early dawn of a new day of confidence and hope, flow from the sympathetic and patriotic heart of the President of the United States, Herbert Hoover.

At the very beginning of our economic depression President Hoover called together a conference of leaders in industry and labor, at which conference verbal agreements were entered into which stabilized the wages of labor and saved this country from the repetition of more than 2,500 strikes and lockouts during the closing days of President Wilson's administration. He also inaugurated a program of public construction, including improvements of navigable rivers and harbors, and immediate construction of public roads and public buildings. In order that the stricken farmers, afflicted by the drought in 21 States, might rehabilitate themselves, a system of loans was provided. The credit of the country having been undermined, the President directed the mobilization of the banks of the country in a huge credit association, with a capital stock of \$500,000,000. This act inspired confidence in our financial institutions and the withdrawal of deposits from the banks of the country was checked, and the normal flow of credit was reestablished.

In January, 1932, in a special message to the Congress of the United States, President Hoover's recommendation embodied a proposal to strengthen the Federal land bank system by extending additional credit of \$125,000,000. This proposal has been translated into a law and its operation has prevented wholesale foreclosures on farm lands and has increased the facilities of the farm banks for additional farm loans to farmers throughout the country. In order to inspire and maintain confidence in agriculture, industry, and labor he recommended the creation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, with a capital credit of \$2,000,000,000. This corporation has been duly created by the Congress of the United States, and this act of the administration gives to the Nation every assurance that credit channels will be opened and will provide financing facilities for our financial institutions, agriculture, commerce, and industry.

The President has also recommended the immediate passage of a law creating a system of home loan discount banks similar in character to the Federal land banks. This law would encourage home ownership, and would relieve the present home owners from financial embarrassment by providing facilities of renewing mortgages and deeds of trust on homes, and would relieve the heavy financial burdens of country banks, savings banks, and building and loan associations, and would undoubtedly stimulate home ownership and home building throughout the entire country.

Other recommendations of the President which are now occupying the attention of Congress are—

1. An enlargement of the discount privileges of the Federal reserve system in cases of emergency;
2. Development of a plan guaranteeing an early distribution of dividends to depositors of closed banks;
3. A revision of our transportation laws so as to restore confidence in the bonds of our railroads, a majority of which bonds are held by savings banks and insurance companies throughout the country; and
4. The revision of our national bank laws in order to safeguard the depositors of our banks and create confidence in the banking institutions of our country.

The significance of the reconstruction program of the President of the United States is based on an effort to unshackle the forces of economic recovery by releasing the credit of the Nation and directing its flow into the channels of commerce and industry, which will check the further degeneration of prices and will fortify us against continued shocks of world instability. This program of President Hoover is the only program of relief from our present economic conditions before the Nation. No other individual nor party has offered a solution or a remedy.

The Democratic press is responsible for the widespread propaganda of praise for legislative efforts of the Democratic Party to remedy our present depressed economic conditions in Congress. This is false propaganda. There is no program for relief except the program of President Hoover. The Democratic Party is without a definite program; but it endeavors to take credit for the constructive ideas of the President. As I have already stated, the House of Representatives of the United States Congress is under the complete control and domination of the Democratic Party. Every legislative committee of the House is also controlled by the Democrats. Bills introduced in Congress are referred by a Democratic speaker to a Democratic committee. No objections can be found to this general practice of our 2-party system. When the Republican Party is in political control the organization and the procedure is the same.

At the beginning of the present session of Congress President Hoover designated several Republican friends of the administration to introduce bills carrying out his constructive recommenda-

tions to Congress. These bills were promptly referred to appropriate committees; but, these committees being Democratic in complexion, no consideration was given these bills until some Democratic member of the committee in which the bill was pending introduced the same bill without a single alteration and amendment. Then the Hoover bill introduced and sponsored by a Democrat was ready for a hearing, consideration, and favorable report. These political maneuvers are without precedent and are responsible for this false propaganda in the Democratic press. This procedure is conclusive proof that, despite vicious condemnation of the Republican Party, the Democratic Party is without chart and compass in this maelstrom of an economic depression.

Verily, the old Democratic mule can not prepare and condition himself for the coming campaign on the scant and stubble pasture of the wide and uncertain range of the Democratic Party; but must necessarily wander beyond his own political fold, in perfect step with his own raucous brays, to the more luxuriant pastures and meadows in the fertile grazing lands of the Republican issues and policies.

Early in the coming month of November the electorate of the United States will have an opportunity to determine the national economic policies of this Government for the next four years. If the Democratic Party is successful, what paramount issues declared by that party will be translated into national policies of our Government? No man knows. Not even the three unterrified "musketiers" of that party, at a Jackson Day banquet held recently in the city of Washington, while bandying and flourishing the time-worn political weapons of calumny, abuse, and defamation, were able to suggest or declare a single fundamental issue. If the broad and constructive program of the Republican Party is destroyed or abandoned, what economic principles will be substituted? Are you willing that the present economic structure of the Nation shall be razed and demolished without definite plans and specifications for the rebuilding of a new structure? My countrymen, this is not the day for the application of vague and indefinite dogma of political expediency. This day of national emergency is not the time for political experiments.

In the light of political history, I have every confidence in the American people that they will not abandon the fundamental principles and doctrines of the Republican Party, which have met the needs of a great people in every emergency. The noble spirit of Abraham Lincoln, on this occasion of the anniversary of his birth, warns the Nation in this day of national emergency, as he warned it in the darkest days of the Civil War, "that we must not swap horses in the middle of the stream." To heed this wise counsel will lead us into the paths of economic recovery, and history will again record the tragic story of an ambitious leader who, in his flight from the militant hosts of Republicanism, caught his head in the sturdy boughs of confidence and faith in the party of Abraham Lincoln and Herbert Hoover; and, like Absalom of old, "was taken up between the heaven and the earth, and the mule that was under him went away."

ROCHESTER (N. Y.) EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT PLAN

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by setting forth the Rochester, N. Y., plan for aiding the unemployed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITLEY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following emergency employment plan:

The Rochester (N. Y.) emergency employment plan recently put into operation is designed (1) to provide additional employment, (2) to stimulate business and trade, and (3) to encourage public confidence in the country's situation by putting idle, or hoarded, dollars back into their wonted channels of circulation. The encouragement of public confidence is a natural by-product, or result, of purposes (1) and (2). The plan does not contemplate foolish or extravagant spending, or buying of things or making of improvements that are not needed or that the purchaser can not afford. In brief, under the plan the citizens of Rochester and Monroe County have signed pledges to spend a specified amount of money within three months from date of the pledge in improving their property by making needed repairs or alterations or purchasing desirable equipment, or by making other needed purchases for self, family, or friends, all of which expenditures might otherwise be deferred.

As a result of a 10-day intensive campaign to put the plan into operation, almost 11,000 individuals and firms of Rochester and Monroe County signed pledges for expenditures aggregating more than \$6,000,000. While the pledges do not specify what the expenditures will be for, those actively in charge of the campaign estimate that about 75 or 80 per cent of the expenditures will be for repairs and improvements to homes, commercial, industrial, and other property. Almost immediately following the campaign merchants, materials dealers, and others connected with the building industry reported a considerable improvement in business, sales, and demand for services, and a marked increase in employment was noted. Many projects covered by the pledges are under way and are furnishing employment to many men who otherwise

might be idle and on the relief rolls of the community. Business men of Rochester state that the campaign also has brought about an attitude of increased confidence in the general situation on the part of residents of the city.

One of the most important features of the plan is the pledge and the "performance" or fulfillment-of-pledge report. The one says "I will" and the other says "I have." Blank forms for these are presented here as follows:

(Date) _____

Believing that a dollar invested in employing labor does more good than a dollar given as charity, and desiring to help to increase employment, I hereby pledge that I will, during the next three months (or before _____, 1932), expend at least \$_____ in improving my home, factory, store, buildings, or grounds by purchasing desirable equipment or by making needed additions, repairs, or alterations; and/or by making personal purchases for myself, family, or friends, which otherwise might be deferred.

Signed _____
Address _____

Pledge obtained by _____ Ward _____ District _____
Block _____

Please return this report to Mr. _____, Street _____
(Block worker)
_____, Telephone _____, or to Civic Committee on Unemployment, 28 Spring Street, Rochester, N. Y.

(Date) _____

The expenditure which I pledged in the amount of \$_____ has been completed. The total expenditure was \$_____, of which \$_____ was the cost of improvements to real estate, \$_____ was for equipment, furnishings, and personal effects.

Signed _____
Address _____

The plan was originated by Libanus M. Todd, a retired manufacturer and public-spirited citizen of Rochester. He first presented the idea to some of his friends and associates and to leaders in the chamber of commerce and civic committee on unemployment. This group indorsed the plan, and it was decided that before the plan was given any publicity in the press it should be tested out among a representative cross section of the residents of Rochester and Monroe County, to provide an organization committee of sponsors for the plan. Mr. Todd and a few friends conducted an informal canvass and procured 486 sponsors for the emergency employment plan. The sponsors not only indorsed the plan, but each individually signed a pledge to spend a total of \$701,644 for real-estate improvements and other purchases. Among the committee of sponsors were the members of the board of county supervisors, members of the city council, of the city and county judiciary, educational institutions and public schools, and individuals connected with the community's business, industrial, professional, labor, and occupational pursuits. Virtually all classes and income groups in the community were represented in the committee of sponsors.

The campaign to put the plan into operation was conducted under the auspices of the Rochester Civic Committee on Unemployment, with Mr. Todd as general chairman. A campaign manager organized a force of canvassers to present the plan to every potential participant in Rochester and Monroe County. Campaign headquarters were established at the chamber of commerce.

The organization and drive were similar to the war-time Liberty bond drives, or a present-day community chest drive. The city and county were divided into seven divisions, comprising certain wards or townships, with two chairmen for each division. These division chairmen themselves selected a ward chairman for each ward or township, and the ward chairmen selected their own block captains, who in turn picked their own block workers or solicitors. The organization personnel comprised 14 division chairmen, 24 ward chairmen, 19 township chairmen, 100 block captains, and 994 block workers, a total of 1,151 active workers for the campaign. There also was a publicity committee.

The campaign began on Friday, December 4, and ended on Monday, December 14. A campaign fund of \$11,000 was contributed by public-spirited citizens, firms, and corporations. The campaign started with an organization dinner December 4 and closed with a final-report dinner on December 14. Between those dates five noon-day luncheons were held for the workers, when reports were made public as to the amount of pledges secured each day. Stories were carried in the newspapers each day giving the total number of pledges secured and total amount pledged up to date. The expense of luncheons and dinners for the workers, and expense of printing, mailing, stenographic work, and similar services were paid for from the campaign fund. The campaign manager and canvassers received no pay for their work but contributed their time and services on a strictly volunteer basis. About \$5,100 was spent for dinners and luncheons for the workers, approximately \$1,200 for stenographers and clerk hire, etc., and the balance for printed matter, blanks, pledges, canvassers' manual, identification buttons for canvassers, and other material connected with the campaign. Each of the three daily newspapers donated five pages of display advertising space for the campaign, or a total of 15 pages. In addition each newspaper assigned reporters to assist in giving publicity to the plan and campaign and to help promote it.

About three weeks were required to organize the campaign and secure the workers needed. Both men and women were numbered among the volunteer workers. Before the canvassers were sent out each was given careful instructions as to the purposes of the campaign, methods of making solicitations, etc., and all were given special printed information which would enable them to answer questions put to them by residents concerning the campaign and its objects. Each canvasser also was furnished with a badge on which was printed "Emergency Employment Plan, Official Worker," for identification purposes, and each canvasser was supplied with pledge blanks and cards containing information to the householder as to how to procure workers from the Public Employment Center of Rochester. A large envelope containing the canvassers' manual and other printed material, all of which was called the "worker's kit," was furnished each canvasser. On the envelope was printed the schedule of dinner and luncheon meetings.

On a 4-page folder there was printed the citizen's pledge, the "performance" or fulfillment of pledge report, a page of information to the citizen as to how he could help relieve the unemployment situation, and a page containing a check list of improvements that might be made to real estate. The pledge and performance report were printed on one page, separated by a perforation and numbered in duplicate. The pledge when signed was torn off and turned in by the canvasser to the campaign headquarters and the citizen retained the performance report and the check list of improvements and information concerning how he could help in relieving unemployment under the plan.

No definite goal as to the amount of pledges to be secured was set at the outset of the campaign. Sponsors of the plan, however, hoped that \$3,000,000 in pledges could be secured in the 10-day drive. This figure was almost reached at the end of the sixth day. At the final report dinner-meeting it was found that a total of 10,771 individuals and firms of Rochester city and Monroe County had signed pledges to spend \$6,026,351.96 during the ensuing three months for repairs, improvements, or equipment for real-estate properties—homes, stores, plants, factories, etc.—and in buying articles which they needed, but which otherwise they would not have purchased during the next three months. In this total there are included expenditures by a large public utility amounting to about \$600,000 for extensions and improvements which it originally had planned to make over a period of three years, but which, as a result of the campaign the company advanced to the present.

Up to December 21, the campaign organization had received reports of fulfillment of pledges from 25 individuals and firms. These 25 pledges promised expenditures aggregating \$21,000, but the reports showed that a total of \$25,000 had been expended, or \$4,000 more than called for in the pledges. The campaign organization intends to check up on the pledges obtained and "performance" reports received at the end of the three months' period from the time the campaign ended, and those who have not sent in reports of fulfillment of pledges will be interviewed by the canvassers who made the original solicitation to ascertain why the performance reports have not been made.

One prominent citizen of Rochester who already had made repairs and improvements to his property and who wished to participate in this campaign decided to install a garbage-disposal plant at his home. Another citizen arranged with the public employment center of Rochester to send him a competent carpenter, whom he would give three days' work each week around his home or store for the next three months. Mr. Todd, originator of the plan, arranged to expend \$7,000 in improving the grounds about his home. In order to make these improvements it was necessary to obtain a carload of brick from a brick manufacturer in Virginia, two carloads of shrubs and plants, etc., from Ohio and Pennsylvania, and a carload of fertilizer from Buffalo, N. Y. Thus the Rochester local unemployment plan helped out the railroads to the extent of transporting four carloads of materials, a brick manufacturer, and several workers in Virginia were furnished some business and employment, nurserymen and their employees in Ohio and Pennsylvania were given some business and work, and the brick dealer and nurserymen and their employees in Rochester were given business and work by this project. In addition, Mr. Todd has employed 15 workers full time for six weeks making improvements at his home; the force of workmen was reduced to 9 for an additional week and 4 or 5 workers will be given an extra two weeks' work on this one job. In the spring he will have some more work for several men finishing up the job.

The daily newspapers assigned their own reporters to handle the news stories relating to the campaign and "played up" the developments daily in a way to attract the attention of the Monroe County reading public to the employment plan and the campaign. The publicity committee, comprising expert advertising men of Rochester, prepared the advertisements for the campaign, using such headlines as, "Sign the pledge for prosperity to stimulate business and relieve unemployment"; "Daddy's got a job, mamma! Daddy's got a job!"; "Take a 'guest-eye' inventory to-day; be ready when the agent of prosperity knocks at your door"; "What can I do to stimulate business and relieve unemployment?"; "You personally can do a lot to cure unemployment"; "Jobs, wages, prosperity—you hold the key"; "Have you signed the pledge for prosperity?" Each advertisement was attractively designed and some were aptly illustrated, and each carried a copy of the pledge and a facsimile of the official workers' button. Several of the

advertisements also carried the check list of suggested repairs or improvements that could be made to property.

The names of persons or firms signing pledges were not made public. It will be noted that the pledges do not state what the expenditures will be made for, this being left entirely to the judgment of the signer. Every effort was made to eliminate all forms of commercialism from the canvass and from the campaign so that the residents would not be subjected to annoyance from solicitation by trade groups. Many of the business interests of the community, however, did take legitimate advantage of the opportunity to tie in with the campaign in their advertising and merchandising methods. Many merchants and other business groups gave support to the unemployment campaign by reference to it in their advertising. All interests in the community cooperated in every way possible to promote the plan and the campaign in its behalf.

In the publicity and in the canvassers' solicitations emphasis was given to the fact that the Rochester emergency employment plan was not a fund-raising campaign to provide relief but a movement to provide employment and stimulate business in expenditures for things needed and which the resident could afford to buy. The sponsors of the plan and the organization specifically declined to recommend any contractors or dealers to persons desiring to have certain work done, but the canvassers and members of the committee furnished inquiring residents with cards containing information as to how to procure a worker by telephoning or calling upon the Public Employment Center of Rochester. Also when the canvassers interviewed residents who were in need of relief they were furnished the names and addresses of the relief agencies to whom they should apply for assistance.

The information for residents as to what they can do under the plan to assist in providing additional employment and stimulating business, and which is printed on the 4-page folder containing the pledge and performance report, reads as follows:

"PROGRAM UNDER THE AUSPICES OF CIVIC COMMITTEE ON UNEMPLOYMENT"

"The independent effort of an individual may be but a feeble gesture, but when he joins in mass formation with his neighbors the same effort becomes an irresistible and mighty force."

HOW YOU CAN HELP

There are two things you can do—

1. Improve and repair your home, factory, store, buildings, or grounds.

2. Exercise your normal purchasing power and buy the articles you need and want.

As you do one or both of these things jobs are provided and unemployment is relieved. Whether your real-estate improvements and your purchases be large or small, you are making a real contribution toward supplying jobs, and your efforts, joined with the efforts of thousands of others, will have an immense effect.

Many suggestions for property improvement, probably unthought of, the carrying out of which means the direct employment of labor, are listed on the next page.

While the sponsors of this plan do not urge any foolish spending, they do nevertheless believe that if every individual who is in a position to exercise even his normal purchasing power would do so instead of feeling that it is essential to cut expenditures to the minimum, there would be immediate relief from the present stagnation in building, manufacturing, and distribution.

The idle dollar benefits no one. On the other hand, every dollar which is put into circulation at the present time keeps on working for the benefit of the entire community.

For this reason this program should appeal to you to do your personal share in relieving the present situation by spending money for the direct employment of labor, as suggested, and by the indirect employment of labor in the consumption of products already made or produced.

Concretely, this means that the individual who is accustomed to buying one suit of clothes should not try to make the old one do; that the individual who usually purchases two suits should not now provide himself with merely one; and that the purchase of all other appareling should be considered in the same way; that if new furnishings or equipment for the home are contemplated, they should be purchased immediately rather than deferred; that if you want a new radio, buy it now; that if a new automobile is being considered, contact a dealer at once; that so-called luxuries should not be considered as nonessentials; that the Christmas list should be extended rather than curtailed.

The purchase of all of these things suggested and hundreds not enumerated means employment. This means jobs and wages.

The Rochester committee in charge of the emergency employment campaign is having printed a complete detailed description of the Rochester plan, form of organization, and methods employed in promoting the campaign to put the plan into operation. This material will be furnished to other communities upon request. Also, individuals familiar with the Rochester plan and procedure in organizing and carrying out the campaign probably can be procured to go to other cities and assist in putting the plan into operation if such assistance is deemed necessary by the local committee in charge of unemployment relief.

The results achieved in Rochester under the plan here described have attracted marked interest and attention from cities all over

the United States, and several communities already have written to the Rochester committee for information on this subject, with the idea of putting the plan into operation in their own communities.

EMERGENCY HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

Mr. POULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up a privileged resolution, House Resolution 163.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Resolution 163

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 9642, a bill to authorize supplemental appropriations for emergency highway construction, with a view to increasing employment.

That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Roads, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and any amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9642) to authorize supplemental appropriations for emergency highway construction, with a view to increasing employment.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. BLANTON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title to the bill.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes. Mr. Chairman, I shall not discuss the great value of a national highway system, nor shall I elaborate on how necessary one is for the happiness and progress of the American people.

I feel, on the other hand, that if I can furnish any information on this measure, the committee had rather hear that.

This is an emergency measure submitted primarily to help unemployment; and, secondly, to help the several States of the Union, who are now unable to match their Federal-aid allotments.

In connection with the unemployment feature, let me remind the committee that by to-night it will be the first measure that will have passed either branch of Congress that seeks to give a job to a single human being in this country. [Applause.]

We had a similar measure last year for \$80,000,000. This bill seeks to appropriate \$120,000,000 to be apportioned according to existing methods among the several States, and also there is an appropriation of twelve and a half million dollars for roads in national parks, national forests, Indian reservations, and so forth. Now, the committee has been most desirous of preserving the integrity of the Federal road law.

For that reason, and following the precedent set last year, this appropriation is in the form of a temporary loan to the States, which shall be deducted out of future authorizations in 10 annual installments, beginning in the fiscal year of 1938. If the committee will recall, the appropriation that passed last year for \$80,000,000 provided for deductions in five annual payments, and \$16,000,000 of that sum has already been deducted.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert in my remarks a table showing the amount that each State will receive of the \$120,000,000 authorization, and a table showing the current status of Federal-aid construction, together with the unexpended balance to the credit of each State as of January 1, 1932, and the monthly average employment table on Federal and State highway work in 1931.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to insert the matter indicated at this point. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The tables referred to are as follows:

Amount each State would receive of an apportionment of \$120,000,000, using the percentages of the regular 1933 apportionment

Alabama	\$2,550,053
Arizona	1,762,636
Arkansas	2,091,431
California	4,669,711
Colorado	2,255,281
Connecticut	779,324
Delaware	600,000
Florida	1,629,204
Georgia	3,120,191
Idaho	1,508,485
Illinois	5,077,245
Indiana	3,060,266
Iowa	3,173,493
Kansas	3,276,334
Kentucky	2,259,648

Louisiana	\$1,740,198
Maine	1,070,600
Maryland	1,015,296
Massachusetts	1,712,774
Michigan	3,783,179
Minnesota	3,373,560
Mississippi	2,160,628
Missouri	3,761,014
Montana	2,525,108
Nebraska	2,557,683
Nevada	1,578,025
New Hampshire	600,000
New Jersey	1,659,121
New Mexico	1,962,340
New York	6,057,965
North Carolina	2,890,203
North Dakota	1,940,325
Ohio	4,501,069
Oklahoma	2,893,101
Oregon	1,996,128
Pennsylvania	5,261,052
Rhode Island	600,000
South Carolina	1,666,492
South Dakota	2,002,076
Tennessee	2,609,757
Texas	7,668,024
Utah	1,387,190
Vermont	600,000
Virginia	2,258,196
Washington	1,905,627
West Virginia	1,316,720
Wisconsin	2,992,438
Wyoming	1,540,811
Hawaii	600,000

120,000,000

United States Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Public Roads, current status of Federal-aid road construction as of January 31, 1932

State	Completed mileage	Under construction					Approved for construction					Balance of Federal-aid funds avail- able for new projects	
		Estimated total cost	Federal-aid allotted	Mileage			Estimated total cost	Federal-aid allotted	Mileage				
				Initial	Stage ¹	Total			Initial	Stage ¹	Total		
Alabama	2,405.4	\$1,541,469.27	\$748,838.58	62.6		62.6							\$5,389,119.2
Arizona	1,113.5	3,100,414.28	2,038,617.71	151.7	84.6	236.3	\$214,260.26	\$161,316.54	18.7		18.7		1,491,162.58
Arkansas	1,919.7	3,795,361.89	1,772,437.69	86.0	72.7	158.7	362,032.53	181,016.26	17.3		17.3		1,991,752.04
California	2,214.2	10,488,440.29	4,635,262.51	222.0	44.8	266.8	2,245,227.41	1,086,831.59	47.1	14.1	61.2		1,804,409.95
Colorado	1,516.8	5,212,372.26	2,662,850.29	221.9	66.0	287.9	547,326.44	269,751.14	16.3		16.3		2,067,570.68
Connecticut	288.5	3,084,244.77	1,151,757.90	22.9		22.9							713,252.14
Delaware	361.6	154,414.00	77,207.00	4.3		4.3	465,212.50	232,068.25	25.6		25.6		338,081.68
Florida	581.7	5,239,072.77	2,432,193.81	147.0		147.0	49,004.56	24,502.28	.1		.1		3,021,969.03
Georgia	2,999.0	6,988,646.29	3,250,027.65	184.6	153.5	338.1	988,337.56	494,168.76	38.0	17.2	55.2		1,744,179.93
Idaho	1,485.3	1,726,513.35	998,918.80	85.9	80.3	166.2	252,882.85	152,007.29	18.0		18.0		1,423,480.58
Illinois	2,627.1	22,713,061.29	10,563,419.39	665.8	28.7	694.5	3,796,850.76	1,642,351.35	140.2	9.0	149.2		2,905,293.87
Indiana	1,787.9	7,155,748.04	3,539,673.88	189.2		189.2	3,897,200.83	1,789,777.42	141.4	2.9	144.3		1,584,606.30
Iowa	3,379.0	331,333.50	138,397.76		11.9	11.9	1,743,306.44	826,683.01	61.3	18.0	79.3		1,973,117.19
Kansas	3,649.7	3,005,615.48	1,391,823.86	161.2	15.3	176.5	2,923,789.57	1,427,002.36	188.8	5.4	194.2		1,760,691.19
Kentucky	1,871.7	2,348,515.36	1,067,373.05	137.2	4.0	141.2	577,471.72	269,284.62	13.3	41.6	54.9		1,727,826.78
Louisiana	1,641.7	7,216,064.49	2,803,668.93	112.6	10.6	123.2	1,295,507.93	68,270.07	.5		.5		1,066,879.52
Maine	706.0	1,804,346.15	789,080.76	31.4		31.4	37,546.34	14,085.00	.9		.9		1,318,971.43
Maryland	770.1	441,451.15	149,608.89	13.4		13.4	250,874.75	125,437.37	11.8		11.8		785,651.09
Massachusetts	808.2	7,747,403.42	2,949,352.76	70.1		70.1	784,090.49	348,347.37	8.6	.2	8.8		687,103.02
Michigan	1,974.3	10,437,694.69	4,523,057.69	374.3	58.2	432.5	800,781.24	378,823.37	34.0	8.5	42.5		3,168,443.32
Minnesota	4,291.3	2,464,947.82	876,785.45	41.1	58.7	99.8	7,747,946.74	2,474,985.76	157.5	201.9	359.4		150,028.10
Mississippi	1,792.4	4,014,998.22	1,968,703.64	169.4	78.0	247.4	103,524.13	51,762.05	9.5		9.5		5,383,500.51
Missouri	2,951.2	2,333,230.66	975,887.91	62.8	3.4	66.2	1,560,496.24	703,143.85	60.1	3.5	63.6		3,047,358.46
Montana	2,613.9	5,417,980.89	3,034,629.24	442.7	22.8	465.5	403,394.86	224,388.61	61.4	.5	61.9		3,253,079.46
Nebraska	4,152.9	4,920,915.22	2,406,758.29	206.5	76.6	283.1	84,279.58	41,975.61	2.1		2.1		2,647,063.39
Nevada	1,345.8	974,327.23	744,741.76	30.4	89.8	120.2							1,558,863.00
New Hampshire	417.6	676,512.12	265,632.44	13.4	2.5	15.9							547,810.24
New Jersey	582.1	5,708,263.52	1,976,522.53	59.5	.6	60.1							1,604,603.13
New Mexico	2,177.7	2,748,137.56	1,788,348.90	135.7	13.8	149.5	481,698.71	303,425.51	14.2	10.4	24.6		1,260,679.38
New York	3,239.0	12,643,900.00	5,610,500.06	282.2		282.2	3,514,800.00	1,350,000.00	68.7		68.7		4,436,572.98
North Carolina	2,221.6	1,348,388.13	653,221.40	60.9		60.9	245,906.23	122,653.10	17.4	4.0	21.4		3,858,352.40
North Dakota	5,118.2	1,828,691.83	918,958.57	160.4	171.9	332.3	1,327,226.48	679,129.03	149.7	259.5	409.2		2,037,725.62
Ohio	2,829.6	7,002,906.22	2,423,630.10	100.1	29.8	129.9	1,173,200.00	572,962.46	10.7	.4	11.1		4,086,869.51
Oklahoma	2,194.1	5,179,730.02	2,522,789.07	137.4	83.4	220.8	498,297.51	217,779.48	10.8		10.8		2,328,368.59
Oregon	1,645.6	3,287,004.12	1,535,226.98	84.0	35.7	119.7	454,179.00	237,632.02	12.8	11.1	23.9		1,896,364.63
Pennsylvania	3,012.1	4,193,848.20	1,917,622.88	45.8		45.8							5,096,998.06
Rhode Island	257.5	811,658.61	427,281.05	16.6		16.6	81,305.62	40,652.81	2.2		2.2		329,207.16
South Carolina	1,997.0	2,679,138.08	1,148,707.78	63.0	43.6	106.6							1,375,312.87
South Dakota	4,035.8	2,935,366.20	1,625,070.82	174.8	175.3	350.1	497,616.45	300,502.55	54.3		54.3		1,267,439.45
Tennessee	1,662.4	848,984.19	422,357.41	24.2	8.7	32.9	437,058.09	202,974.45	13.6	6.4	20.0		3,883,841.72
Texas	7,590.0	13,052,768.47	5,861,194.84	653.6	163.0	816.6	2,728,062.52	1,234,664.59	197.3	46.8	244.1		6,787,271.18
Utah	1,218.6	650,176.96	452,772.23	59.5	.4	59.9	367,710.43	272,080.68	23.1	3.3	26.4		1,294,723.37
Vermont	339.1	* 104,832.58	52,345.06	4.3		4.3							572,077.12
Virginia	1,851.3	2,748,074.56	1,320,166.66	144.2	16.3	160.5	160,977.42	80,488.71	5.4		5.4		2,090,486.72
Washington	1,195.4	1,927,757.38	947,168.56	56.9		56.9	556,682.40	222,000.00	27.5		27.5		1,779,628.99
West Virginia	884.0	1,735,061.39	761,625.34	44.6	10.5	55.1	187,685.92	86,032.31	.7		.7		1,220,976.79
Wisconsin	2,664.8	3,119,586.51	1,155,563.12	138.5	14.3	152.8	90,647.32	45,000.00		3.5	3.5		2,681,895.81
Wyoming	2,022.1	2,522,816.68	1,492,230.45	173.6	88.9	262.5	384,014.48	246,606.78		47.4	47.4		785,801.14
Hawaii	63.1	974,113.04	445,557.39	30.0		30.0	82,324.99	22,869.00	1.5		1.5		2,018,071.60
Total	100,262.6	203,386,392.15	93,715,561.81	6,559.2	1,818.6	8,377.8	44,401,309.30	19,236,256.49	1,682.4	715.6	2,398.0		106,844,531.07

¹ The term "stage construction" refers to additional work done on projects previously improved with Federal aid. In general, such additional work consists of the construction of a surface of higher type than was provided in the initial improvement.

Employment on Federal and State highway work, 1931

Month	Forest	Park	Federal aid			Total Federal	State		Grand total
			Regular	Emergency	Total		Construction	Maintenance	
January.....	228	107	25,944	5,000	30,944	31,279	48,621	68,700	148,600
February.....	548	172	26,867	10,000	36,867	37,587	53,787	80,186	171,530
March.....	1,278	172	28,068	25,334	53,402	54,852	58,701	91,334	204,887
April.....	2,663	350	39,683	54,864	94,547	97,560	72,212	93,732	263,504
May.....	3,803	1,002	39,518	82,387	121,905	126,715	89,764	94,452	310,931
June.....	4,722	2,168	40,223	107,402	147,625	154,515	101,275	107,092	363,432
July.....	6,617	2,625	40,290	115,167	155,456	164,708	112,638	108,003	385,349
August.....	6,219	2,895	39,506	102,798	142,304	151,418	121,172	117,359	389,949
September.....	6,048	3,189	42,203	64,060	106,263	116,100	123,404	117,113	356,617
October.....	5,183	2,842	41,423	39,421	80,844	88,869	116,752	124,483	330,104
November.....	3,550	2,054	35,534	21,328	56,862	62,466	103,198	124,687	290,351
December.....	1,193	920	25,973	7,905	33,878	35,991	74,543	134,437	244,971
Total man months.....	42,057	18,496	425,241	636,266	1,061,507	1,122,060	1,076,067	1,202,178	3,460,305
Average.....	3,505	1,541	35,437	53,022	88,459	93,505	89,672	105,182	288,359

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Chairman, section 3 of this bill is new legislation. It has the hearty approval of the Bureau of Roads. At the proper time an amendment will be offered by the committee to insert after the word "employment," on page 3, line 24, the words "of local labor." In connection with labor, let me say that this table which I have inserted in the RECORD shows that approximately 300,000 men received employment from the \$80,000,000 fund per month last year; but twice that many will be employed in transportation and preparation of materials for construction, and it is estimated by the Bureau of Roads that this measure will directly and indirectly give employment to 1,000,000 American citizens.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Would it not be a good idea to have a provision in section 3 that the labor employed should be American citizens. It happens in my State, and I am sure in a number of other States, that foreigners are employed and do the principal part of the work, and if we are going to help local labor, would it not be well to have the bill provide that American citizens should be employed?

Mr. WARREN. I shall reserve my opinion on that and think about it during the discussion of the bill. I can tell the gentleman that in the expenditure of the \$80,000,000 emergency fund last year not a single convict in America was employed on the work.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It is not a question of convicts, it is a question of foreign citizens. For instance, Mexicans and others are employed. If the gentleman or some member of the committee does not offer that amendment, I propose to offer such an amendment myself.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Mr. JONES. I have been interested in the same subject, and I have drafted an amendment that no part of the fund should be used to pay any contractor or subcontractor who employs alien labor on any of these projects. I ask the gentleman to have that in mind. I believe the work on these projects should be limited to citizens of the United States.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I suggest that situations of that kind can be largely covered by the laws of the several States, which are really to be considered in these public contracts.

Mr. WARREN. I understood that is true from Mr. MacDonald, the Chief of the Bureau of Roads.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. In the gentleman's opening statement he said that this is an emergency measure. I wish the gentleman would address himself more to this feature of the bill, explaining why, when the Committee on Ways and Means is laboring to bring out a tax bill, and while the people generally are protesting against being increasingly taxed, this measure, calling for \$132,500,000, as a new project, not pro-

vided for in the Budget, not recommended, should now be authorized and appropriated for.

Mr. WARREN. Here is why it is an emergency. The gentleman knows that there are over 8,000,000 people walking the streets of this Nation to-day unemployed. It has been demonstrated by all of the evidence before the committee, and given to us by the Bureau of Roads, that this will give employment directly and indirectly to 1,000,000 people.

There is also an additional reason. The several States of the Union will have in the Treasury to their credit \$109,000,000 of Federal-aid funds that three-fourths of them are unable to match. That money will lapse and be turned back into the Treasury within a period of two years. To show that we have made this measure an emergency it has been provided that this money must be under contract and expended prior to June, 1933.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Mr. MAY. Then the real effect of this measure is to make available to States the \$109,000,000 they are not able to make available themselves?

Mr. WARREN. It means an immediate expenditure, which the Bureau of Roads has informed the committee it can at once get to work on of approximately \$250,000,000 throughout this Nation. [Applause.] It has also been conclusively shown to the committee and approved by the Bureau of Roads and the State highway commissions in, I believe, every State in the Union that 90 per cent of the road dollar after eight successive steps goes to labor. To bear that out I ask unanimous consent to insert here a table and also a statement released to-day by the Bureau of Roads in that connection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

Distribution of \$1,000 paid for concrete highway, showing the approximate total amount which reaches labor in each of eight successive steps

The contractor's distribution of this \$1,000:

Labor.....	\$141.00
Aggregates.....	324.00
Cement.....	324.00
Steel.....	27.00
Equipment.....	100.00
Plant installation.....	27.00
Bonding, etc.....	22.00
Gross profit.....	35.00
	<u>1,000.00</u>

After distribution of mill and quarry items:

Salaries and wages.....	302.70
Freight.....	406.70
Materials and supplies.....	17.15
Fuel.....	35.50
Interest.....	14.10
Taxes.....	24.10
Department and repairs.....	131.15
Depletion.....	10.50
Profits.....	48.10
Miscellaneous.....	10.00
	<u>1,000.00</u>

After distribution of freight charges:

Salaries and wages.....	\$477.70
Materials and supplies.....	57.55
Fuel.....	57.20
Interest.....	61.70
Taxes.....	49.70
Depreciation and repairs.....	184.65
Profit.....	91.00
Depletion.....	10.50
Redistribution.....	10.00

1,000.00

After distribution of fuel costs:

Salaries and wages.....	516.60
Materials and supplies.....	64.20
Interest and rents.....	63.75
Taxes.....	51.40
Repairs and depreciation.....	188.75
Profit.....	91.00
Depletion.....	14.90
Redistribution.....	10.00

1,000.00

After distribution of repairs and depreciation:

Salaries and wages.....	572.60
Materials and supplies.....	170.80
Interest, rents, etc.....	65.65
Taxes.....	56.10
Depletion.....	14.90
Profit.....	109.85
Redistribution.....	10.00

1,000.00

After distribution of cost of materials and supplies:

Salaries and wages.....	730.25
Interest and rents.....	73.85
Taxes.....	39.50
Depletion.....	17.85
Profit.....	128.55
Redistribution.....	10.00

1,000.00

After distribution of taxes and \$10 for "redistribution" has been redistributed:

Salaries and wages.....	770.85
Interest and rents.....	81.25
Profit.....	129.85
Reserve for depletion.....	18.05

1,000.00

After distribution of profits, interest, rents, and depletion:

Salaries and wages.....	910.00
Expended by owners.....	90.00

1,000.00

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., February 27, 1932.

LABOR GETS GREAT SHARE OF HIGHWAY EXPENDITURE

At least 85 per cent and possibly more than 90 per cent of the money expended for a concrete pavement is ultimately paid out as wages and salaries, according to the Bureau of Public Roads of the United States Department of Agriculture.

This conclusion is reached as a result of studies of typical concrete construction jobs, and it is believed to be approximately true for other high-type pavements. Expenditures were traced back through various channels until the money went into personal use.

About 15 per cent of the cost of concrete pavements is paid to men employed directly on the construction jobs. About 12 per cent is paid to men employed in quarries, sand pits, mills, and factories where the materials are produced, and about 14 per cent is paid to men employed by the transportation companies (principally the railroads) for hauling these materials to the jobs. Part of the cost is paid to the men who build the machinery and equipment used in constructing highways. Even more is paid to the men who build the machinery and equipment used in the sand pits, the quarries, the cement mills, and the steel mills where road materials are produced and to those who build the equipment of companies that deliver these materials. Some is paid to the miners, the men who work in the refineries, and those who work on the pipe lines and in the oil fields—the industries which provide the fuel that produces the power used in producing materials, in transporting them, and in working them into finished pavements.

A part of the cost of high-type roads goes to those industries which furnish the supplies used all along the line. Some goes to the men who make blasting powder, some to those who make hand tools; and even the very minor items, such as cotton waste and the sheet of emery paper with which the mechanic smooths a joint on a machine he is repairing, absorb a bit of the cost at which pavements are built.

About 75 per cent of the cost of a high-type pavement filters back through the transportation companies and through industry

to men who work for salaries and wages at points distant from where these highways are built. Most of these men are city workers employed by the transportation companies or in the mills and factories—men who may never see more than a few of the highways their efforts help to build but who, taken altogether, receive several times as much in salaries and wages as is paid to the men who are directly employed in building them.

The bureau's studies further show that out of every \$100 paid to the contractors who build concrete pavements—and much the same thing is true of high-type highway construction generally—more than \$40 passes through the hands of the transportation companies (principally railroads) and assists these companies in maintaining a profitable volume of business. Approximately \$13 is paid to the producers of aggregate (sand, gravel, broken stone, and slag); about \$24 goes to the cement mills. At least \$16 ultimately goes to the manufacturers of machinery and equipment, including trucks, railroad cars, locomotives, etc. Some is paid to the manufacturers of explosives; some to the producers of coal; some to the gasoline refineries; and much to manufacturers who contribute in lesser degree by supplying materials used by those who produce the materials used in highway construction and those who transport them or who build the equipment used at some point in the long series of processes out of which highways result.

From these facts it is apparent that the construction of highways, particularly those of the higher types, not only provides work for those employed on the job, but it provides a great deal more work for men employed in industry and in transportation; and that, in addition to this, it supplies a large volume of business to those industries through which the materials that must be used are collected, worked, and reworked before they become a part of a finished pavement.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Does that statement contain the ratio to each State in the Union?

Mr. WARREN. It does.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Mr. KETCHAM. I have listened to what the gentleman has had to say with very much interest concerning the method of distribution. As I understood him, he offers this proposition primarily as an emergency matter to meet the unemployment situation.

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Mr. KETCHAM. If that be true, has the gentleman given any consideration to the method of distribution that would consider population as the basis, rather than consider roads as the basis, upon the theory that there is the greatest amount of need not where there is the greatest amount of roads but where there is the greatest amount of people?

Mr. WARREN. I think it is the purpose and desire of the House to maintain the integrity of the Federal-aid loan system as now existing.

Mr. COLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WARREN. Certainly.

Mr. COLTON. That is one of the primary elements taken into consideration in the distribution of all road appropriations.

Mr. KETCHAM. I am familiar with that; but I intend to offer an amendment and some discussion a little later on, so I wanted the gentleman's reaction to the matter at this time. My amendment will be to propose distribution according to population, disregarding the road mileage and area limits that are now in the present form of distribution.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WARREN. I yield.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman tell the committee in what way this will help unemployment in the large centers of population, particularly the cities?

Mr. WARREN. I will say to the gentleman that indirectly it helps them a great deal. I do not have time to enter into the statement that I just put into the Record, issued by the Bureau of Roads this morning, and appearing in practically all the newspapers this morning, but the gentleman will see that indirectly it covers all of the country.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WARREN. Certainly.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. In answering that question, if the gentleman will go down to the place where they line up for jobs in the city of Washington, he will see that is where they go to get men to build roads.

Mr. WARREN. Absolutely.

Now, section 4 is new legislation as an amendment to the Federal highway act, and that should be particularly appealing to States like Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Ohio, Maryland, North Carolina, Florida, and perhaps a few others. Section 4 permits those States which have completed 90 per cent of their 7 per cent system to add 1 per cent additional mileage. I understand that in the case of Ohio there might have been some doubt if Ohio could have used all of the appropriation authorized by this bill, but under section 4, if they have completed 90 per cent of their system, they are allowed 1 per cent additional mileage.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina has consumed 15 minutes.

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BLANTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 9642 and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. POUL. Mr. Speaker, I intend to make a unanimous-consent request, but before doing so I would like to make an explanation.

I should have conferred with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. PURNELL], the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules, as to the discussion of the rule. I had assumed that there was no opposition to the rule.

When the Speaker put the question to the House as to whether or not the rule should be adopted without debate, perhaps I should have intervened and inquired of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. PURNELL] whether he desired debate on that side. I did not do so, and I accept whatever criticism I should shoulder for my failure in that respect.

I have been informed by my friend the gentleman from Indiana that there were requests for time on his side.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the time for general debate on the resolution be increased to two and one-half hours, in order that the one-half hour additional may take care of such requests as the gentleman from Indiana may have for time, and that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. PURNELL] may control the additional 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Will the House indulge the Chair to make a statement? The Chair will state that he should assume the major portion of responsibility of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POW]. The Chair sometimes puts questions rather quickly, for the purpose of transaction of business, when he thinks there is no opposition. I think the Chair is more to blame than the gentleman from North Carolina, because the Chair put the question rather quickly and it was agreed to before any Member had an opportunity to object.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. PURNELL. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and, of course, I shall not object, I merely make the reservation in order to say that the statement made by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POW] is entirely unnecessary. The gentleman is so thoroughly incapable of doing anybody an injustice at any time in any way that it is needless to say his apology is unnecessary. [Applause.]

I wish to say in justification of my own position that I was not entirely asleep. Gentlemen were conferring with me who had requested time, and before I realized it the Speaker's gavel fell.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 8642).

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Speaker, pending that motion, I would like to propound a parliamentary inquiry. The rule provides that the time shall be controlled one-half by the chair-

man of the Committee on Roads and one-half by the ranking minority member. I do not see in the Chamber to-day the ranking minority member; in fact, the two other ranking members of the committee. I would like to inquire who will control the time on this side?

The SPEAKER. It is the Chair's interpretation that the next gentleman on the committee who is present would control the time.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from North Carolina.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 8642, with Mr. BLANTON in the chair.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD].

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the committee, a few days ago the Speaker of the House appointed a select committee and charged it with the duty of seeing if it were possible to reduce public expenditures. That committee is now working under that appointment.

The chairman of the Appropriations Committee has repeatedly informed the House as to the efforts being made by the various subcommittees under his jurisdiction to bring about a reduction in public expenditures. He has told you time and time again, acting under the suggestion and advice of the President of the United States, that we are not following the recommendations made by the Budget but are cutting the estimates to the core, yet to my utter amazement a legislative committee of this House has reported a bill which carries an appropriation of \$132,500,000, to be made immediately available.

How inconsistent that is. What a travesty it is for the Appropriations Committee and this select committee to be trying to save a few thousand dollars here and a few thousand dollars there and then with one swoop take from the Treasury \$132,500,000.

I wish to say in passing that if the Agricultural Department is recommending this thing, as the gentleman who preceded me says they have done, it should be condemned by every taxpayer in the land.

Mr. WARREN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. WARREN. The gentleman did not understand me. I did not say that the Department of Agriculture recommended the passage of this bill, but I said they approved the form of it.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Of course, that makes quite a difference. However, there have already been too many attempts made by the heads of bureaus and even by Cabinet members to undermine what the President of the United States is trying to do in saving money to the Treasury of the United States. [Applause.]

Now, gentlemen, look at the predicament we are in. You are asking here for an appropriation of \$132,500,000. How is that amount to be secured except by adding to the burdens of the taxpayers of this country? What good is it going to do? It will be just simply like placing a thin coat of salve over the country, so far as giving employment is concerned, but you are increasing our deficit in the amount of \$132,500,000 and making it necessary to raise that much more by additional taxation.

We are told that in order to restore confidence in this country we must balance the Budget. Are we going to balance the Budget by adding to the deficit? Are we going to balance the Budget by adding more and more to the burdens of the taxpayers?

The Ways and Means Committee has been laboring long and earnestly in an effort to devise ways and means of raising additional revenue for the purpose of helping to balance this Budget.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. Did not the gentleman from North Carolina state that there is already \$109,000,000 of this money appropriated?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I do not know what he stated, but we have the testimony of the head of the Bureau of Roads that he can not spend more than \$90,000,000 in carrying out the proposals under the existing program. Of course, they can make a new program in order to carry out the program provided for in this bill. But why should we do that when we are looking for every possible means of raising revenue to balance the Budget, and why should we do anything which will add to the present deficit?

I say to you gentlemen that we are not only piling up a debt against the United States, but by this action we will pile up a debt against every State. In every State of the Union to-day citizens are complaining and crying out against the burdens of taxation. They are holding indignation meetings in Indiana. They are holding them in Illinois. They are holding them in almost every State in the Union, and protesting against additional taxation and demanding that taxes be reduced.

Now, then, this \$132,500,000, if appropriated by the Congress, must be met by \$132,500,000 on the part of the States which receive it. I note there is a provision in the bill to the effect that they will have 10 years of time in which to repay it. However, that is a curse to them. You pass this bill and many States which can ill afford to burden their taxpayers with this additional amount of taxation will say, "Well, we have 10 years' time in which to repay it, so we will take advantage of it." Credit of this character is one of the worst things that can ever befall a man, and it is the worst thing that can befall a State or nation.

Gentlemen, if we are in earnest; if we mean what we have been saying, that we are going to balance the Budget in order to secure the confidence of the people and make the economic situation of this country normal, so that the credit of the country will not be impaired, this bill ought to be defeated.

I hope if it passes, thus proving that this Congress is unmindful of its duty to the Treasury of the United States and to the taxpayers of the United States, the President will not have it on his desk five minutes before he vetoes it. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON].

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the committee reporting this bill to the House, I wish to say that I am heartily in favor of its passage. Indeed, the action of the committee was unanimous. There was not a voice in opposition. The first draft of the bill contained some substantial changes in the existing law. These proposed changes had considerable merit, but it was thought that they might provoke opposition either in the House or in the Senate. And so, after discussion, our chairman was instructed to introduce a bill leaving out all controversial matters except a few minor provisions intended to extend the scope of the bill, so as to achieve more efficiently its beneficent purpose.

I appeared with our chairman and others before the Rules Committee; the urgent situation and the immediate benefits to be derived were presented; and, as a result, by unanimous vote, a rule brings this matter before the House at this time.

The Almon bill carries an appropriation of \$120,000,000 to the States for emergency construction on the Federal highway system, with the main view of increasing employment. It will give the most widespread employment and achieve the widest possible distribution of the Federal funds, while the taxpayer will get what he needs. It has been estimated that if this appropriation passes, 1,000,000 men will almost immediately be put to work; and that 90 per cent of the money expended will go for labor. Under the bill local labor on the projects is given preference. In addition to the man who works directly on the road there are those who would obtain work in providing materials and producing all sorts of goods for those who directly or indirectly obtain employ-

ment thereunder; there are those who haul the sand and gravel, burn the cement, work in the manufacturing plants, are employed by the transportation companies that carry the construction materials; and there are the engineers, contractors, and manufacturers who are benefited. A leaflet issued by the National Unemployment League last April states that the direct employment of 1,000,000 men on public roads would employ indirectly at least 3,000,000 more workers in making, preparing, and transporting material.

Under this bill, States which are to-day unable to match the 50-50 per cent requirement of our present Federal aid highway act may use these emergency funds, provided they are expended by June 30, 1933, and may reimburse the Federal Government over a period of 10 years, commencing with the fiscal year 1933.

We are now in the third year of this depression. Community and local aid are nearing exhaustion. Some of the large cities are practically bankrupt. States are even in a precarious financial condition. The ranks of the unemployed are steadily increasing, and will continue to increase during the months of seasonal unemployment. With these conditions before us it is apparent that some form of Federal aid is imperative. It is now but a question of what form this relief shall take which, besides bringing immediate help, will least encourage reliance on Federal aid and will, on the other hand, stimulate local and individual contributions in conjunction with the Federal aid. It has been established that road construction is of such nature that work can be put under way in a comparatively short time and in immense volume. Speed and volume are obviously at this time necessary and vital considerations.

The American Road Builders' Association has pointed out:

1. Highways are not overproduced; the necessity for them is unquestioned; the need is nation-wide.
2. Highway departments are trained and plans are ready.
3. Highways built now are lasting and prices at the present time low.
4. Highway construction will absorb persons previously employed in varied activities without previous training in highway construction, in which they can be assigned tasks that will not impose drudgery upon them.
5. Every dollar spent for highway improvement lessens the amount communities must raise for direct relief.

No one can question the necessity of Congress doing everything in its power in this emergency. We can not ignore, forget, or deny the real conditions that exist in the country. I hold in my hand the RECORD of February 2, in which is found the speech of the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE]. His argument was addressed to the proposition, "We are confronted by the most serious economic crisis of our history." He summed up admirably and succinctly the statistical evidence. I quote:

Industrial production in the United States has declined from the peak of 1929 approximately 45 per cent.
Freight-car loadings have declined 38.40 per cent.
Prices, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, have declined 30 per cent.
Stock prices, according to the Standard Statistical Index, are at 58.

Manufacturing employment is at 69.4, a decline of practically one-third since the beginning of the depression.
The building industry is down approximately 50 per cent.

Residential building in the United States has declined approximately 80 per cent.

The net income of 550 of the largest industrial corporations in the United States in 1929 was \$3,500,000,000; their net income for 1931 was approximately \$1,100,000,000.

Defaults on all bonds, both foreign and domestic, ordinarily in normal times average about \$150,000,000 to \$200,000,000 per year. In 1930 there was a default of \$360,000,000 of bonds and in 1931 approximately \$2,000,000,000 of bonds were in default. The paper loss on these listed bonds since 1928 amounts, roughly, to \$3,000,000,000.

In 1928 we had 491 bank failures; in 1929 we had 642 bank failures; in 1930 we had 1,345 bank failures; up to November 30, 1931, there were 1,932 bank failures.

The Senator concludes his masterly address by asserting:

As a consequence there has been terrific increase in the extent of the total unemployment in the United States.

The Senator supported his statement by inserting in the RECORD of February 2 replies to his questionnaire, Exhibit B,

pages 3204-3367. The evidence of detailed and universal want and suffering is simply overwhelming, conclusive to any unprejudiced mind.

Mr. Chairman, this is but one of many bills enacted by the Congress to meet the present deplorable condition that is existing among our people. And it is not the intent of the proponents of this measure in any way to sidetrack any other proper and remedial legislation.

The most important problem before the statesmanship and the citizenship of our country to-day is the right solution of the present economic depression. We seem to find ourselves in a long, dark, financial tunnel. The keys with which again to open the doors to prosperity seem to be hopelessly lost. Let us not helplessly ask, What can we do? Some economic, political, moral, or spiritual adjustment must be made. The question with us is, Are we doing all we can? Are we doing the right thing in a wise way? To get our true bearing, let us examine the situation outwardly and inwardly, to see, if we can, what we have done to bring upon us this calamity.

Out of the mass of material that has come to me through the radio and the mail, from the speeches heard in Congress, and from sermons preached from the pulpits, and innumerable publications on the present situation, I have in my own mind a composite picture of this economic or moral evil.

Pope Pius XI terms it "a new plague." He describes the affliction that has come upon us as "the financial crisis, which has descended upon every people and with steady and frightening progress is bringing unemployment to every land." As we analyze our situation, we learn from the Pope's encyclical letter and from other international authorities that these distressing times are not with us alone, but that they are world-wide in their scope. All countries, it is true, have their own peculiar problems, but all are inextricably interdependent upon one another in the common struggle to win through this present financial crisis. That we, the richest country in the world, have not escaped we know only too well.

We note first that this depression has the usual elements of an ordinary panic—lowered prices, lowered wages, unemployment, and misery—that usually attend them all.

But the present affliction is out of the ordinary. It is marked with some very strange characteristics. We find that there is want in the midst of plenty; overproduction on the one side and underconsumption on the other. We see a world bursting with goods, with limitless capacity to produce more goods, yet want, even approaching the pinch of starvation, has appeared "like a ghost at a feast."

Comment is made on every hand of the fact that many once rich are becoming poor and the poor are becoming poorer; and this is true notwithstanding that we live in what some one has called a "thing age." We are buried under the multitude of our possessions. This machine age has hurled men out of employment; and there is a tendency to return to the primitive state of barter in the exchange of goods.

Some unjust and oppressive conditions have come about. The farmers contracted billions of debts when prices were high and they are now called upon to repay them when prices are low, thus more than doubling the debt with interest. This makes payment almost impossible. Business likewise is in a contracted condition—the worst this country has ever seen. In the days of prosperity American industries built or renewed themselves on price levels about 30 per cent higher than those that now exist. This means that all fixed expenses—bond interest, rents, depreciation—have been increased by approximately one-third. And the imposition of a problem like this upon industry means either small profits, no profits, or worse than no profits—insolvency. For this reason other nations, like England; indeed, all of the nations but two—France and the United States—have been driven off the gold standard, so that trade itself creates the value of the money. Business men and farmers alike are insisting that this situation must be met by a process of inflation. They see no other way to meet it.

The demand is that we decrease the value of the dollar as England lowered that of the pound sterling. We have made a partial move in that direction in the Glass-Steagall legislation.

It is found now that the worst spots are the big financial centers; the shrinkage of values of the stocks of big business has been unparalleled in history. Millionaires have suddenly found themselves almost paupers. And while the little fellow has suffered greatly, it has come to be the day of the small business man, for he is fairly secure.

When comparisons are made with other distressing times, it is a general observation that this is more enduring than them all; it has been on us several years, and the end is not yet. Indeed, things seem to be growing worse. Skilled observers assert that the present situation is "not at all comparable" to former depressions; "is the most difficult to control" and "the most incorruptible."

Students of history see in it a striking resemblance to periods like the fall of the Roman Empire, the Renaissance, the Reformation, and the beginning of the political and social revolutions in England and in France in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. There are even those who suggest that we are "participants in the decline and possible shipwreck of a civilization." Predictions are made by students of prophecy that these times are warning signals of "the end of time."

Certainly it is abundantly evident that the wisest of statesmen in the country are perplexed. They do not know exactly what is coming, and the citizenship, great and small, is possessed with a powerful feeling of discontent and vague fear. It is a sort of mass failure of confidence. We seem to be passing over to some other condition of economic life.

This critical era is also marked by strange contrasts; while everybody sees and admits that no nation lives for itself alone, and statesmen appeal to one another for co-operation, there is everywhere noticed a stiffening of national sentiment, a veritable mania of economic nationalism. Nations are raising tariff walls against each other and increasing armaments. Nations are competing with one another for national self-sufficiency and isolation, while the whole world groans for international friendliness and cooperation for the world good.

Finally, Congress is confused by a multitude of counsel; and as the elections are coming on, the spirit of politics is throwing over all efforts a "preelection paralysis." There is little or no effort by statesmen to ascertain or eliminate the underlying causes. Both political parties are but temporarily treating the symptoms.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this depression is an economic, composite effect of gigantic proportions. It did not come by chance. Nothing really happens by chance. We are under the government of law; where there is an effect there also must be a commensurate composite cause or causes. As I have sifted the material that has come to me, I would select these as the primary causes of our present calamity: First in importance, the World War; next, dishonest stock manipulation and practices; third, inordinate extravagance on the part of the American people.

Taking these up in the reverse order, I need but call attention to the fact that we have been indulging in an orgy of extravagance under high-pressure salesmanship and on the installment plan. We have enjoyed everything from chewing gum to the radio without stint. I will not take the time to give you a statistical report in billions of dollars of our investment as a people in luxuries and sports. Suffice it to point out that when we indulge our appetites for these luxuries and sports, we do not practice the necessary thrift that will enable us to meet hard times and depressions without want or suffering.

We have also indulged in an orgy of stock manipulation on a most dishonest basis. I have not time now to point out the manipulation of stocks in a wide scope but wish especially to call attention to the debauch in stock gambling which we have just passed through. Figures show that investors lost through short selling seventeen billions on 25 of the leading industries, and more than \$57,000,000,000

in all the stock of our industrials. Altogether too much. No wonder there is a lack of confidence in bonds and stocks of big business. No wonder they almost go begging upon the market to-day. And no wonder that there is business depression on the part of Americans who so unwisely sought to enrich themselves by taking a flyer on Wall Street.

But the primary cause, according to the President of the United States, and authorities too numerous to mention, we are suffering from the effects of our "war spree." The first result of our adventure in the World War was tremendous inflation. Immediately at the end of the war came the first deflation. This especially fell with unbearable weight upon the farms of the country.

On account of the loaning by the Government itself of more than ten billions to the warring nations of Europe after the war, most of which we may never get back even though we have compromised with these countries on the fairest possible terms, and loaning more than ten billions to countries of Europe through the agencies of private bankers who floated loans among our people and which have depreciated in value enormously, we succeeded in building up a very profitable trade with these nations of Europe. This stimulus, together with this orgy of stock gambling, made it appear that we were enjoying prosperity unparalleled. But when the bubble burst there came the second deflation of prices, in the midst of which we are now.

It is not my purpose at this time to discuss the remedies resorted to by Congress under the leadership of President Hoover. I simply wish to express my opinion that we are dealing only with symptoms. We have to do something under these conditions. But dealing with symptoms will not restore prosperity. We must remove the causes and we must prevent their recurrence. Otherwise this will be a mere warning of worse things to come. As I have already stated, much of what we have done to date is merely dealing with symptoms. This, I admit, was necessary as a temporary palliative, but the cure requires a removal of the roots of the trouble. I did not vote for the \$2,000,000,000 Reconstruction Finance Corporation. I did not vote for it because I could see in it little more than a form of relief for the bankers who are responsible for the financial muddle our country now is in. I agreed with those who refused to create a \$2,000,000,000 fund to "liquidate bankers' mistakes." Those who are the direct beneficiaries of this fund are the same agencies who brought on the financial debacle.

I admit, too, that what we are doing in this emergency highway construction bill is not a panacea for unemployment, which is too far-reaching for that, still in so far as this relief goes it is sound. I urge its passage. [Applause.]

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire to use.

Mr. Chairman, I have been a member of the Committee on Roads for the past 17 years. I was a member of the committee and aided in the preparation of the national aid road law of 1916, when Judge Shackelford, of Missouri, was chairman of our committee.

During all these years no politics has ever been heard or considered in the committee. It is strictly a nonpartisan committee.

This bill was considered carefully, and extensive hearings were held, and when it came to the time to vote, every member of the committee, both Democrats and Republicans, voted for it, and nearly all the members were there. I know there were four or five members of the minority party present, led by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. COLTON].

The Committee on Roads has reported out my bill, H. R. 9642, which has for a special purpose the authorization of supplemental appropriations for emergency highway construction with the view of increasing employment.

It is not necessary for me to take any time to demonstrate to the House the seriousness of the employment situation. There are various estimates given as to the total number of unemployed people now in the country. The American Federation of Labor estimates that there are at present 8,300,000 people out of employment. This figure may be larger than some other estimates, but it is evident to all that the unemployed number is sufficiently high to

merit our immediate consideration in the hope that we may do something in a legislative way to help the situation.

The last Congress, with the unanimous approval of everyone who has any authority in the legislative matters, provided \$80,000,000 of funds to be added to the authorization already made, to be advanced to the States for the building of roads, and also provided that this fund must all be expended by September 1, 1931. This limited the real time of this extra amount to less than nine months.

The Committee on Roads, in the hearings presented to it by those who have authority in handling this work, obtained the information that the emergency program alone aided in the construction of 13,161 more miles of roads than would have otherwise been completed, and these jobs or projects were scattered throughout the country, for they were carried on in 1,227 counties out of the 3,075 counties of the United States. The emergency advance of \$80,000,000 permitted the States to use this fund in conjunction with their Federal-aid allotments as well as State funds, thus making a road program of \$256,250,000.

In this connection it should also be noted that the Federal Government does not make expenditures for maintenance of Federal-aid highways. The funds are limited to construction only, and therefore we should understand that in this amount of construction the State highway departments also did an additional amount of work, including maintenance, the payment of principal on bonds and interest, together with the entire maintenance of their highway department, that made the total expenditure for the calendar year of 1931 of \$1,100,000,000. [Applause.]

In connection with the matter of unemployment throughout the country the Committee on Roads had information presented to it by the Bureau of Public Roads giving very definite figures as to the amount of employment during the year 1931 taken from the actual count of men on the job. With the permission of the House I will include a table showing employment on Federal and State highway work by the month. This statement shows that the direct employment on the roads by both Federal and State authorities at the peak month of the year was 389,949. The average for the whole 12 months of the year was 288,359. It is unanimously agreed by all persons making investigation along this line that for every man working on the job there are two other men employed furnishing the materials and transporting the materials to the jobs and other incidental work. Therefore, the indirect employment would show for the peak month a total of 780,000 and the average for the entire year about 600,000. The average grand total employment was approximately 900,000 men, and at the peak month, which was August, the employed were 1,170,000 men. [Applause.]

There has been so much interest shown as to the number of people employed by the States in road building that the State Highway Officials Association has prepared a table to show the number of people employed on July 1 in the several States and showing the ratio of the employment to the total population of each State concerned.

In comparing this tabulation no consideration whatsoever is given to the number of prisoners used by the States in road construction or maintenance.

This table shows a report from 46 of the 48 States and gives the number of people employed directly by the State highway departments as 130,429, those employed by contractors as 188,507, making a grand total of 318,936.

Comparing the number of people employed to the population of the 46 States reporting, it shows that there was one person employed for every 369 persons in those States. Taking it by States, the largest number of people employed is 1 person for each 70 population in the State of Maine.

It ought not to be necessary to state that these people are employed exclusively on the State highway system or in the State highway department, and this has nothing to do with persons employed in road work by counties, townships, or cities, neither does it have anything to do with persons who are employed exclusively in preparing materials to be used in road-construction work.

Likewise this has no reference to people employed by the Federal Government in road work, whether departmental, in forests, Indian reservations, public domain, or national parks.

I am asking permission to include this table showing persons employed on State Highway systems July 1, 1931, and ratio of employment to total population.

The thousands of unemployed people who make up the class physically able to work on the roads or prepare materials for the roads, and yet have nothing to do, is very strikingly reflected in the great reduction in road costs. A very careful estimate by the engineers handling the State work shows that during the past year roads have been built at a saving of 26 per cent over the prosperous times of 1929. This is additional evidence why the Federal Government should at this time increase its payments toward roads construction, since a much larger mileage of roads can be improved and thereby make more effective and economical our rural transportation, so essential for the agricultural districts.

It is obvious to everyone that road improvements have greatly facilitated the use of personal transportation upon the highways. We are informed that in 1931 more than 26,000,000 motor vehicles were used in this country. Of these, 22,450,000 are passenger cars and 3,490,000 are trucks. The farmers of the country own 26 per cent of the trucks and 18 per cent of the cars. Fifty-seven per cent of all of the cars are on farms and in towns under 10,000 population. These figures show what a tremendous demand it is upon us to give the people the most economic use of the highways possible, as the money involved in the maintenance of these motor vehicles requires that roads should be constructed in a way to conserve this investment. Therefore, while the road costs are lower, it is without a question good business to build the largest mileage of roads that can be produced, and in that manner extend the service to these millions of automobile users.

In the bill before you the committee has authorized an appropriation of \$120,000,000 to carry on the same character of work and under the same plans as in the case of the \$80,000,000 authorized by the last Congress. In view of the fact that the employment situation at the present time is fully as serious, if not more than it was a year ago, and also in view of the fact that in the advance of the \$80,000,000 provision was made for collection of this from future authorizations beginning with the coming fiscal year, thus reducing the actual Federal aid for the period, deductions this year from authorization are \$16,000,000. Likewise, unusual efforts were made to absorb all of the funds from whatsoever source in order to greatly enlarge employment. Such being the case, the State highway department, as well as the Federal Government, faced the situation at the beginning of this January of having a greater reduced amount of funds available for this year's program. Authorization of \$120,000,000 would be necessary to make possible approximately the same Federal expenditure for the calendar year 1932 as obtained during the calendar year 1931.

In this connection I am also asking permission to incorporate in my remarks a table furnished me by the Bureau of Public Roads covering the unobligated balance of Federal-aid funds available for new projects as of January 31, 1932, less than 30 days from this time. It should be noted in this connection that exclusive of the Federal-aid funds normally due for the fiscal year beginning July 1 next, that there is only about \$15,000,000 not under contract in the entire United States. Of the \$109,000,000 for the fiscal year 1933 over \$10,000,000 has already been obligated. There are a very few States which have not caught up with obligating their Federal funds, but that is due to a serious financial situation in those States, and this authorization will serve a double purpose in their case, as without this advance they would not have the funds to match the Federal funds as required by law.

This bill also provides that the repayment shall be made to the Federal Government of this \$120,000,000 by deductions from the future Federal authorizations to the States cover-

ing a period of 10 years, beginning with the year 1938. This is the date when the deductions for the \$80,000,000 authorization last year will have been completed. For the information of the House I am asking permission to include in my remarks a table showing the approximate amount of funds each State will receive of the \$120,000,000 advanced provided in this bill. The purpose of this bill is to relieve unemployment and allow the States to match Federal-aid funds already available with the funds provided in this measure. To illustrate this, Alabama's part of this fund, amounting to \$2,550,053, can be used to match an equal amount of the unexpended balance of Federal-aid funds available to Alabama, amounting to \$5,339,119. I wish also to have you note that the States are given until June 30, 1933, to absorb this advance for the reason that we have been much later in providing this legislation than in the last Congress, and we believe greater employment can be secured by not requiring the expenditure so rapidly as was required last year.

In addition to the legislation authorizing the regular Federal-aid amounts, the committee has added smaller amounts covering other activities of the Federal Government in road building. This same feature was carried out in the legislation of the last Congress in connection with the \$80,000,000 advance. The additional items provided are as follows:

For national forests highways, \$5,000,000; for roads, trails, bridges, fire lanes, and so forth, in the national forests, \$3,000,000; for roads in national parks and national monuments, \$1,500,000; for roads on Indian reservations, which employment is exclusively Indian labor, \$1,000,000; and for main roads through unappropriated or unreserved public lands not in forest reservations, \$2,000,000.

In section 3 of this bill the committee has made a special provision to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to make rules and regulations for carrying out the provisions of this act, with the view of providing the maximum employment of local labor consistent with reasonable economy of construction. The general legislation governing the Federal Government's activities in road building provides that the Secretary of Agriculture shall make rules and regulations to carry on the work, but the committee felt that in this case, since these funds are to be advanced for the sole purpose of aiding in employment, that he should have the authority to provide in the regulations such requirements that would enable a greater number of people to be employed than might be under other circumstances.

The last paragraph of the bill makes a slight change in the existing law. The present law provides that before the State can add to its 7 per cent system, which, as you know, is the Federal-aid system, it must have that system completed to meet the traffic requirements before additional miles can be added to the system, so that they may secure Federal aid. It is found in a number of States that the construction has now arrived at the place where the rigid enforcement of this law causes not only embarrassing situations but an uneconomic one. There are States which have omitted the construction of approaches to railroad crossings, awaiting the construction of those crossings because of the financial condition of the railroads, which in every State are required to pay a part of the cost of the elimination of these dangerous railroad grade crossings. The total mileage in this item alone is large and will not permit the State to add to its system. There are other cases where it is very inexpedient to attempt to change the present Federal-aid system. The committee, therefore, felt the time had arrived when there should be a slight change made in this requirement. This section therefore provides that whenever a State has made provision for the completion and maintenance of 90 per cent of its system, as required by the present law, that the State may add additional mileage equal to not more than 1 per cent of the total road mileage of that State. The committee felt that since this is emergency legislation, this change in the law should take place at this time to enable these States to make full use of the emergency funds advanced to them.

In testimony presented to the committee there was developed that the State highway departments of all of the States are favorable to this legislation. The financial condition of the States is such that they would not be able to carry on a road program anywhere comparable to that of last year. In addition to the recommendation of all of the State highway departments, the committee also had support from many organizations, including the farm organizations, and all felt that the condition of employment was such that, notwithstanding the great demands on the Federal Treasury, this was an opportunity for the Federal Government to aid materially in relieving the unemployment situation and adding to the wealth of the country by a public improvement lasting in character.

It is not necessary for me to elaborate upon the suffering and hardships that are now being endured by many people throughout the country who have no funds of their own and yet are not given the opportunity to earn their daily bread. Here is an opportunity to relieve to a great extent this situation, and we have the positive assurance that the States have their plans for construction already prepared and on a moment's notice can make use of these funds if provided. [Applause.]

Amount each State would receive of an apportionment of \$120,000,000

Alabama	\$2,550,053
Arizona	1,762,636
Arkansas	2,091,431
California	4,669,711
Colorado	2,255,281
Connecticut	779,324
Delaware	600,000
Florida	1,629,204
Georgia	3,120,191
Idaho	1,508,485
Illinois	5,077,245
Indiana	3,060,266
Iowa	3,173,493
Kansas	3,276,334
Kentucky	2,259,648
Louisiana	1,740,196
Maine	1,070,600
Maryland	1,015,296
Massachusetts	1,712,774
Michigan	3,783,179
Minnesota	3,373,560
Mississippi	2,160,628
Missouri	3,761,014
Montana	2,525,108
Nebraska	2,557,683
Nevada	1,578,025
New Hampshire	600,000
New Jersey	1,659,121
New Mexico	1,982,340
New York	6,057,965
North Carolina	2,890,203
North Dakota	1,940,325
Ohio	4,501,069
Oklahoma	2,893,101
Oregon	1,996,128
Pennsylvania	5,261,052
Rhode Island	600,000
South Carolina	1,636,492
South Dakota	2,002,076

Tennessee	\$2,609,757
Texas	7,668,024
Utah	1,387,190
Vermont	600,000
Virginia	2,258,196
Washington	1,905,627
West Virginia	1,316,720
Wisconsin	2,992,438
Wyoming	1,540,811
Hawaii	600,000

120,000,000

Unobligated balance of Federal-aid funds available for new projects, as of January 31, 1932

State	1931 apportionment		1932 apportionment		1933 apportionment		Total unobligated balance
	Balance unobligated	Per cent	Balance unobligated	Per cent	Balance unobligated	Per cent	
Alabama	\$523,516.31	20.1	\$2,615,434.00	100.0	\$2,250,169.00	100.0	\$5,389,119.31
Arizona					1,491,162.58	95.8	1,491,162.58
Arkansas			145,274.44	6.7	1,846,477.60	100.0	1,991,752.04
California					1,804,409.96	43.8	1,804,409.96
Colorado			78,617.08	3.4	1,988,953.60	100.0	2,067,570.68
Connecticut			25,850.34	3.3	687,401.80	100.0	713,252.14
Delaware					338,031.68	63.9	338,031.68
Florida	41,364.63	2.7	1,543,232.00	100.0	1,437,372.40	100.0	3,021,969.03
Georgia					1,744,179.93	63.3	1,744,179.93
Idaho			93,032.58	6.0	1,330,448.00	100.0	1,423,480.58
Illinois					2,905,293.87	64.9	2,905,293.87
Indiana					1,584,606.50	58.7	1,584,606.50
Iowa					1,973,117.19	70.5	1,973,117.19
Kansas					1,760,691.19	60.9	1,760,691.19
Kentucky					1,727,826.78	86.7	1,727,826.78
Louisiana			120,078.92	7.4	1,537,800.60	100.0	1,657,879.52
Maine			374,803.23	33.4	944,168.20	100.0	1,318,971.43
Maryland					785,651.09	87.7	785,651.09
Massachusetts					687,103.02	45.5	687,103.02
Michigan					3,168,443.32	94.9	3,168,443.32
Minnesota					150,028.10	5.0	150,028.10
Mississippi	1,266,550.71	57.2	2,203,509.00	100.0	1,907,440.80	100.0	5,383,500.51
Missouri					3,047,358.46	91.9	3,047,358.46
Montana			1,022,902.46	39.6	2,230,177.00	100.0	3,253,079.46
Nebraska			391,022.59	14.8	2,256,040.80	100.0	2,647,063.39
Nevada			166,109.60	10.4	1,392,753.40	100.0	1,558,863.00
New Hampshire					529,375.00	100.0	547,810.24
New Jersey			141,119.53	9.0	1,463,483.60	100.0	1,604,603.13
New Mexico					1,260,679.38	72.8	1,260,679.38
New York					4,436,572.98	83.0	4,436,572.98
North Carolina							
North Dakota			1,308,345.40	45.6	2,550,007.00	100.0	3,858,352.40
Ohio			326,789.02	16.3	1,710,936.60	100.0	2,037,725.62
Oklahoma			115,179.11	2.5	3,971,690.40	100.0	4,086,869.51
Oregon					2,328,366.59	91.2	2,328,366.59
Pennsylvania			133,104.03	6.7	1,763,260.60	100.0	1,896,364.63
Rhode Island			456,330.68	8.3	4,640,667.40	100.0	5,096,998.08
South Carolina					329,207.16	62.2	329,207.16
South Dakota					1,375,312.87	93.6	1,375,312.87
Tennessee					1,267,439.45	71.8	1,267,439.45
Texas			1,581,683.12	58.9	2,302,158.60	100.0	3,883,841.72
Utah			17,050.18	2.6	6,770,221.00	100.0	6,787,271.18
Vermont			71,162.57	5.0	1,223,560.80	100.0	1,294,723.37
Virginia			42,702.12	7.0	529,375.00	100.0	572,077.12
Washington			98,106.12	4.1	1,992,380.60	100.0	2,090,486.72
West Virginia			98,412.59	5.1	1,681,216.40	100.0	1,779,628.99
Wisconsin			58,759.59	4.4	1,162,217.20	100.0	1,220,976.79
Wyoming			41,182.81	1.3	2,640,713.00	100.0	2,681,895.81
Hawaii					785,801.14	57.8	785,801.14
Total	1,831,431.65		1,513,911,924.98	11.4	90,221,174.44	85.2	106,844,531.07

¹ The total for Hawaii includes \$880,000, which was set aside as a special fund by the act of Feb. 23, 1931.

Employment on Federal and State highway work, 1931

Month	Forest	Park	Federal aid			Total Federal	State		Grand total
			Regular	Emergency	Total		Construction	Maintenance	
January	228	107	25,944	5,000	30,944	31,279	48,621	68,700	148,600
February	548	173	26,867	10,000	36,867	37,587	53,787	80,186	171,560
March	1,278	172	28,068	25,334	53,402	54,852	58,701	91,334	204,887
April	2,663	350	39,683	54,864	94,547	97,550	72,212	93,732	263,504
May	3,808	1,002	39,518	82,387	121,905	126,715	89,764	94,452	310,931
June	4,722	2,168	40,223	107,402	147,625	154,515	101,275	107,692	363,482
July	6,617	2,625	40,299	116,167	156,466	164,708	112,633	103,003	385,349
August	6,219	2,895	39,506	102,798	142,304	151,418	121,172	117,339	389,949
September	6,048	3,139	42,203	64,600	106,803	116,100	123,404	117,113	356,617
October	5,183	2,842	41,423	39,421	80,844	88,899	116,752	124,483	330,104
November	3,550	2,054	35,534	21,328	56,862	62,466	103,198	124,687	280,361
December	1,193	920	25,973	7,905	33,878	35,991	74,543	134,437	244,971
Total man-months	42,057	18,496	425,241	636,266	1,061,507	1,122,050	1,076,067	1,262,178	3,460,305
Average	3,505	1,541	35,437	53,022	88,459	93,505	89,672	105,182	286,359

Persons employed on State highway systems July 1, 1931, and ratio of employment to total population

State	By State	By contractors	Total	Ratio
Alabama	1,660	2,166	3,823	691
Arizona	(¹)			
Arkansas	3,286	3,414	6,700	276
California	4,255	3,466	7,731	734
Colorado	1,090	2,535	3,625	285
Connecticut	1,901	1,188	3,089	525
Delaware	325	605	930	256
Florida	(¹)			
Georgia	3,372	4,630	8,002	303
Idaho	880	1,595	2,475	178
Illinois	5,435	6,500	11,935	639
Indiana	2,686	3,906	6,592	568
Iowa	1,895	6,850	8,745	282
Kansas	2,928	3,463	6,461	291
Kentucky	4,206	5,077	9,283	264
Louisiana	4,000	12,640	16,640	126
Maine	9,242	2,093	11,335	70
Maryland	2,086	2,847	4,933	331
Massachusetts	2,086	4,047	6,133	692
Michigan	2,422	7,313	9,735	497
Minnesota	3,111	6,455	9,566	268
Mississippi	1,240	2,300	3,540	568
Missouri	4,468	7,590	12,058	300
Montana	850	3,000	3,850	113
Nebraska	1,850	3,350	5,200	264
Nevada	396	639	1,035	87
New Hampshire	3,238	1,427	4,665	99
New Jersey	1,791	3,792	5,583	723
New Mexico	1,400	2,600	4,000	105
New York	6,033	14,078	20,111	501
North Carolina	4,000	2,500	6,500	487
North Dakota	1,120	2,500	3,620	160
Ohio	6,500	18,000	24,500	271
Oklahoma	2,675	2,670	5,345	448
Oregon	1,750	2,100	3,850	247
Pennsylvania	8,932	6,676	15,608	617
Rhode Island	302	850	1,152	596
South Carolina	1,452	3,937	5,389	322
South Dakota	675	1,150	1,825	379
Tennessee	1,801	933	2,734	957
Texas	5,700	8,750	14,450	403
Utah	2,073	985	3,058	166
Vermont	2,030	506	2,536	141
Virginia	3,000	2,600	5,600	432
Washington	2,069	2,295	4,364	358
West Virginia	2,798	4,415	7,213	239
Wisconsin	4,506	7,160	11,726	250
Wyoming	764	1,270	2,034	110
Total	130,429	188,507	318,936	369

¹ No report.

² Field force only.

NOTE.—This table does not include prison labor.

Mr. PURNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five minutes.

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the committee, these walls have hardly ceased reverberating from the numerous speeches that have been made recently on the subject of economy, until we find ourselves confronted with a bill which proposes to take out of the Federal Treasury \$132,500,000 additional for highway construction.

I am just as anxious as anyone in this House to relieve unemployment, but until some one comes forward and tells us where we are to get the \$132,500,000 to pay the cost of this bill, I think we ought to cease considering it.

I think the answer to much of the activity in behalf of this bill can be found in this list. Here is the bait that is being used to put this program through. I hold in my hand a list of the approximate amounts that will be available to each one of the States of the Union if this bill is passed.

The list discloses that the States will receive sums ranging from \$600,000 to \$7,668,024, the amount to be received by the State of Texas. That money can be taken by the respective States and used, as I understand it, for the purpose of matching Federal funds, and is to be repaid at some distant future time, if at all.

If it would insure employment to any appreciable number of men; if a substantial part of each dollar appropriated would go to labor, we might think twice before opposing it. But I am reliably informed and believe that only a small per cent will actually find its way into the pockets of the laboring men of the country. Since most of the road-construction work of the country is now done by machinery the greater part of the money will find its way into the pockets of those who furnish the materials rather than those who are unemployed.

For that reason, and many others to be discussed by others, it strikes me that we ought not act favorably upon this measure.

We have just provided for the appointment of an economy committee to devise ways and means of saving money, and here in one fell swoop we propose to appropriate more money than that committee will ever be able to save, and it is money that need not, and should not, be appropriated at this time. [Applause.]

We shall soon see whether those who have been railing against extravagance and preaching economy were in earnest or were making an empty gesture.

If we are to balance the Budget and reduce expenses of government we must be consistent. We can not reduce today and increase to-morrow. I grant you it may take a little courage to vote to deny your States the amounts they might receive under this bill, but it would be far easier to do that than to explain to the taxpayers why an additional drain has been placed upon an already overburdened Treasury. For the information of the House, I wish to call attention to the approximate amount each State would receive under this proposal:

Alabama	\$2,550,053
Arizona	1,762,636
Arkansas	2,091,431
California	4,669,711
Colorado	2,255,281
Connecticut	779,324
Delaware	600,000
Florida	1,629,204
Georgia	3,120,191
Idaho	1,508,485
Illinois	5,077,245
Indiana	3,060,266
Iowa	3,173,493
Kansas	3,276,334
Kentucky	2,259,648
Louisiana	1,740,196
Maine	1,070,600
Maryland	1,015,296
Massachusetts	1,712,774
Michigan	3,783,179
Minnesota	3,373,560
Mississippi	2,160,628
Missouri	3,761,014
Montana	2,525,108
Nebraska	2,557,633
Nevada	1,573,025
New Hampshire	600,000
New Jersey	1,659,121
New Mexico	1,962,340
New York	6,057,965
North Carolina	2,890,203
North Dakota	1,940,325
Ohio	4,501,069
Oklahoma	2,893,101
Oregon	1,996,128
Pennsylvania	5,261,052
Rhode Island	600,000
South Carolina	1,666,492
South Dakota	2,002,076
Tennessee	2,609,757
Texas	7,668,024
Utah	1,337,190
Vermont	600,000
Virginia	2,258,196
Washington	1,905,627
West Virginia	1,316,720
Wisconsin	2,992,438
Wyoming	1,540,811
Hawaii	600,000

120,000,000

Let us give notice to the country through our action here to-day that we intend to hold down governmental expenditures and make an honest effort to balance our Budget. [Applause.]

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KETCHAM].

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, as indicated a few moments ago in the questions propounded to the chairman of the committee, or Mr. WARREN, a distinguished member of the committee reporting the bill, I stated to him that under the 5-minute rule I proposed to offer an amendment. I have here the language of the amendment, and if you have a copy of the bill before

you I would like to direct attention to the bill and read my amendment so that you will know exactly what will be accomplished if the amendment is adopted.

Turn to page 2, line 1. At the end, strike out the period and insert a comma and the following:

Except that such apportionment shall be wholly on the basis of population.

Under the present arrangement the Federal statutes provide that the apportionment of money shall be made on the basis of one-third for area, one-third for population, and one-third for roads.

Mr. COLTON. That would, of course, give New York the largest amount, and they have practically finished their road system.

Mr. BACON. And New York has the greatest proportion of unemployed.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, in the two sentences just uttered is to be found the real meat of the whole situation, and I think we ought to face it fairly and squarely. In response to my question the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WARREN] said that primarily this proposition is one of relief for unemployment, and in that connection that roads are to be used as the instrumentality for the application of this relief. The major proposition, then, as I say, is one of relief rather than of an extensive program of road building. If that be true, certainly my amendment is based upon an entirely logical theory, namely, that relief ought to go where the folks are who need the relief to the greatest possible extent.

Let me show now exactly how that will operate. I have before me a table which is a table prepared by the committee, showing the allocation of funds according to the bill as it now stands. In a column parallel to it I have secured from the Bureau of the Census the percentage of population in each State, and upon that percentage basis I have allocated the funds provided in this bill, the \$120,000,000, to the several States upon the basis of population. I also present a table showing the distribution of the funds in this bill as they would go if allocated in accordance with the amount of internal revenue collected in each State. If anybody is interested in the comparison for his particular State, I shall be very glad, indeed, to give that information right now. If there is no interest in it, may I say that the table will be extended in my remarks, and I now ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in that manner.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks as indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The table referred to follows:

Amount each State would receive of an apportionment of \$120,000,000, using the percentages of the regular 1933 apportionment, also taxes paid and population

State	Per cent tax paid	Proportion by tax paid	Present law	Per cent population	Proportion by population
Alabama	0.18	\$216,000	\$2,550,053	2.2	\$2,640,000
Arizona	.09	108,000	1,762,636	.4	480,000
Arkansas	.07	84,000	2,091,431	1.5	1,800,000
California	4.65	5,580,000	4,669,711	4.6	5,520,000
Colorado	.64	768,000	2,255,281	.8	960,000
Connecticut	1.54	1,848,000	779,324	1.3	1,560,000
Delaware	1.39	1,668,000	600,000	.2	240,000
Florida	.47	564,000	1,629,204	1.2	1,440,000
Georgia	.27	324,000	3,120,191	2.4	2,880,000
Idaho	.02	24,000	1,503,435	.4	480,000
Illinois	7.83	9,396,000	5,077,245	6.2	7,440,000
Indiana	.88	1,056,000	3,060,206	2.6	3,120,000
Iowa	.42	504,000	3,173,493	2.0	2,400,000
Kansas	.56	672,000	3,276,334	1.5	1,800,000
Kentucky	1.17	1,404,000	2,259,648	2.1	2,520,000
Louisiana	.36	432,000	1,740,196	1.7	2,040,000
Maine	.27	324,000	1,070,600	.6	720,000
Maryland	1.24	1,488,000	1,015,296	1.3	1,560,000
Massachusetts	3.65	4,380,000	1,712,774	3.5	4,200,000
Michigan	4.41	5,292,000	3,783,179	3.9	4,680,000
Minnesota	.85	1,020,000	3,373,560	2.1	2,520,000
Mississippi	.06	72,000	2,169,628	1.6	1,920,000
Missouri	2.12	2,544,000	3,761,014	3.0	3,600,000
Montana	.07	84,000	2,525,108	.4	480,000
Nebraska	.19	228,000	2,867,653	1.1	1,320,000
Nevada	.05	60,000	1,575,025	.1	120,000
New Hampshire	.14	168,000	600,000	.4	480,000

LXXV—307

Amount each State would receive of an apportionment of \$120,000,000, using the percentages of the regular 1933 apportionment, also taxes paid and population—Continued

State	Per cent tax paid	Proportion by tax paid	Present law	Per cent population	Proportion by population
New Jersey	4.01	\$4,812,000	\$1,659,121	3.3	\$3,933,000
New Mexico	.02	24,000	1,962,340	.3	360,000
New York	27.64	33,168,000	6,057,965	10.3	12,360,000
North Carolina	10.89	13,068,000	2,890,203	2.6	3,120,000
North Dakota	.01	12,000	1,940,325	.6	720,000
Ohio	4.64	5,568,000	4,501,069	5.4	6,480,000
Oklahoma	.61	732,000	2,893,101	2.0	2,400,000
Oregon	.18	216,000	1,996,128	.8	960,000
Pennsylvania	7.82	9,384,000	5,261,052	7.8	9,360,000
Rhode Island	.45	540,000	600,000	.6	720,000
South Carolina	.08	96,000	1,666,492	1.4	1,680,000
South Dakota	.03	36,000	2,002,075	.6	720,000
Tennessee	.53	636,000	2,609,757	2.1	2,520,000
Texas	1.54	1,848,000	7,668,024	4.7	5,640,000
Utah	.09	108,000	1,387,190	.4	480,000
Vermont	.07	84,000	600,000	.3	360,000
Virginia	4.67	5,604,000	2,258,196	2.0	2,400,000
Washington	.47	564,000	1,905,627	1.3	1,560,000
West Virginia	.45	540,000	1,316,730	1.4	1,680,000
Wisconsin	1.15	1,380,000	2,992,438	2.4	2,880,000
Wyoming	.24	288,000	1,540,811	.2	240,000
Hawaii	.24	288,000	600,000	.4	480,000
District of Columbia	.68	816,000			
Total	100.00	120,000,000	120,000,000	100.0	120,000,000

Mr. KETCHAM. Under the bill as written the Michigan apportionment will be \$3,783,000, and upon the population basis of distribution Michigan will receive \$4,680,000.

Mr. RANKIN. Does the gentleman base his statement on American citizenship or merely the population—that is, people who happened to be there at the time the census was taken?

Mr. KETCHAM. This is based upon the census of 1930.

Mr. RANKIN. I submit that would not be a fair allotment.

Mr. KETCHAM. It would not appreciably differ from present conditions. I think we have held our own fairly well so far as population is concerned since the figures of 1930 were made.

Mr. BACHMANN. Under the bill as originally written, how much will West Virginia receive?

Mr. KETCHAM. Under the bill as drafted, West Virginia would receive \$1,316,000, using round numbers.

Mr. BACHMANN. And if the gentleman's amendment be adopted by the House, how much will West Virginia receive?

Mr. KETCHAM. \$1,680,000.

Mr. BACHMANN. While the gentleman is increasing West Virginia under that amendment, there are other States that will be decreased.

Mr. KETCHAM. Naturally some other States will be decreased.

Mr. BACHMANN. What is the reason for the increase or the decrease?

Mr. KETCHAM. The reason is plain, indeed. Under the plan of distribution in the bill three elements enter into it, area, population, and road mileage. Under my amendment two of these are eliminated and we distribute only according to population, and that is upon the theory that this bill is not primarily a road measure but a relief measure. I submit that it is good, sound sense that if you are going to distribute relief, you should distribute it where the folks are that need it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Does not the gentleman by his very answer to these questions as to whether a populous State will get such an amount and a nonpopulous State such an amount show that we are here offering a Federal purse to be fought for here by various Representatives in accordance with the population in their States? The gentleman says that this is a relief measure and takes the floor from a Michigan standpoint.

Mr. KETCHAM. Michigan would fare better in the end if she paid her own way in this matter. Under this bill she will pay \$5,292,000 and would receive \$3,783,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Certainly.

Mr. KETCHAM. Wait a moment. The gentleman just opened this subject and he has suggested another set of

tables which will be read with great interest, namely, the contributions made by the States to this very proposition.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I have no doubt but that I have opened the great subject of Federal aid to the States—the so-called 50-50 propositions.

Mr. KETCHAM. If Michigan had simply to pay from her own Treasury the amount that will be required by this bill, she would be a little better off, because if this money were distributed on the basis of Michigan's proportion to her payments of income tax, she would receive \$5,292,000 instead of \$3,783,000, as the bill provides.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes; the income-tax collector has to go into the States where he can find those who have incomes, and here comes Michigan with the demand that because it pays more Federal income it should have more Federal expenditure. The forthcoming tax bill will hit hard everywhere, including Michigan.

Mr. KETCHAM. Exactly. My amendment does not go to the merits of the bill. It simply provides that if the bill does finally pass with \$120,000,000 put on the taxpayers that the expenditures shall be on the basis of relief to folks rather than areas.

Mr. KELLER. What about Illinois?

Mr. KETCHAM. The figures for Illinois are interesting. According to the present bill the distribution to Illinois is \$5,077,000. If my amendment prevails, the distribution to Illinois will be \$7,440,000, an increase of practically \$2,400,000. More for folks—less for areas.

Mr. KNIFFIN. Will the gentleman give the figures for Ohio?

Mr. KETCHAM. Under the bill Ohio would receive \$4,501,000, and if my amendment prevails, Ohio would receive \$6,480,000. Again more relief for folks—less for areas. My amendment goes only to the \$120,000,000. Beyond that there is \$12,000,000 to be distributed for roads and trails in parks and forests, and I am informed that at the lowest 93 per cent of that amount will be distributed in Western States where there are forests and trails, and so these States are well looked after. My amendment goes only to the distribution of \$120,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. PURNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM].

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, the Members of this House should all attend the sessions of the Committee on Ways and Means. Then, I dare say, they would not be so willing to pass legislation of this kind.

For the fiscal year 1931 the deficit in the Federal Treasury was \$903,000,000. For this year, 1932, it will be \$2,123,000,000, unless we add new expenditures, and then, of course, it will be increased by any amounts that we add now. For 1933, during which fiscal year we have hoped to balance the Budget, the Federal deficit will be \$1,241,000,000. Whence is the money coming for this expenditure that is to be authorized to-day? The Committee on Ways and Means is trying to evolve a method of sales tax, which we hope will bring in \$600,000,000.

Mr. WARREN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I can not yield in the time I have.

We will be required to increase the income taxes, the estate taxes, and almost every other form of tax, to the very utmost. In fact, we will go so far as to reach the vanishing point in income, not only of taxes but even of the people themselves. Then it is proposed now to burden the people with this additional expenditure which, in my opinion, is entirely unnecessary and unwarranted.

Members say this bill will give employment to 1,000,000 men, with an appropriation of \$132,500,000. I have before me the official organ of the American Association of State Highway Officials, called American Highways. This official publication shows that during the year 1931 the total expenditures for highways in the United States was \$1,038,090,101, and only 270,891 people were employed. It has been estimated, beyond any peradventure of doubt, that

the largest number that could possibly be employed with this appropriation for one year is 35,000, and perhaps indirect employment might be given to an additional 20,000.

Gentlemen are laughing. Take the figures. How will the money be spent? Split up \$132,500,000 among 50,000 men and see what employment is given to each of them. But Members say they are going to give employment to 1,000,000 men. How much employment? Just see how ridiculous it is. The total amount is \$132,500,000. Suppose the cost of materials and the profits of all men engaged in this work, the profits of the contractors, the cement manufacturers, the machinery manufacturers, and everyone else are only \$32,000,000 of the entire amount, there will be \$100,000,000 left to distribute among 1,000,000 workmen, and that will give exactly \$100 to each man. Of course, that is perfectly ridiculous. It is preposterous to argue that we will keep a million men employed and give them \$100 each. That is all there is to it. That is the cloth. No more garments can be cut out of it.

How is this money to be returned to the Treasury? The bill provides that after the year 1938, for 10 years after 1938, this money is to be returned to the Federal Treasury. Out of what? Out of taxes paid by the people of the States? Out of appropriations made by the people of the States? No. Out of further money to be taken out of the Federal Treasury, which we now pledge to give the States for 10 years, beginning in 1938.

Mr. WARREN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. No; I can not yield.

If we are sincere in this talk about economy, if we actually intend to take some of the burdens of taxation off the people of the United States, the only way we can do it is to stop these enormous appropriations for aid and assistance to the local governments and the States, and also to reduce some of the large nongovernmental paternalistic bureaus which actually have no place under our system of government. [Applause.] We can not do it by paring away a few millions here and there. We can not do it by trying to save a few dollars here and there. We have to do it by a major operation. We have to take some large steps, and to come now at this moment and propose an additional expenditure of \$132,500,000 it seems to me is perfectly indefensible.

The total expenditure of county and local funds for the calendar year 1931 on roads is estimated by the roads bureau at \$586,340,000. The State funds for the same year are likewise estimated at \$796,801,822. The Federal aid, both regular, emergency, national-park, and national-forest roads expenditure, in the calendar year 1931 was \$260,555,000, being an increase of \$154,907,000 over the previous year of 1930. And yet the total expenditure of local funds and State funds shows a decrease during the year 1931 as compared to the year 1930 of \$121,775,000. In other words, with all of this increase of \$154,907,000 which the Federal Government poured into the States in the year 1931, the States themselves reduced their expenditure by an amount which absorbed all of this increase except \$33,000,000.

To point the moral further, although the Federal Government was appropriating this money in order to increase employment, the States simply decreased their expenditure by almost an equal amount, and therefore by all of the effort of the Federal Government we did not increase employment in any consequential amount. All we did was to transfer workers on the roads from the State pay rolls to the Federal pay rolls. This proposal here to-day will have exactly the same effect. It is simply a dole to the States.

It is interesting to take as an example the State of Pennsylvania, where we have heard much said of the hardships during the past calendar year. In that State the roads bureau estimates that the State expenditure in the year 1930 was \$160,000,000, whereas the State expended less than \$140,000,000 during the calendar year 1931. In other words, the State reduced its expenditures by \$20,000,000 at the same time when the Federal Government increased its contribution to the State by something like \$4,000,000. This case seems even worse than the average.

The truth is that when the Federal Government increased its aid or contribution to the States the States did not meet or match that additional Federal appropriation. That is the very reason why this bill is presented here and we are asked to provide Federal funds without any return or assistance from the States. It is not even a 50-50 proposition. It is now asked that the States get this money, not to match appropriations of their own but to match appropriations which the Federal Government is expected to make beginning in 1938 for 10 years to come.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. No; I can not yield.

If we want to do something that will actually give employment, then we should resume the program of building construction—houses, offices, and the like. Road building is largely a matter of machinery. Everyone who has seen a road crew in operation knows that there are very few men employed upon the work. It is being done by the employment of the very useful and, of course, efficient methods which have come with the improvement of machinery. We will not give the employment that it is thought will result, by any means. But the important thing in this matter is that we are just giving notice to the country that the Congress of the United States does not propose to hold down expenditures, to say nothing about reducing them; that the United States Congress does not propose to balance the Budget; that the United States Government does not propose to take any part in securing that economic recovery, which can not be secured without the balancing of the Federal Budget and the maintenance of the national credit.

Government bonds are selling to-day at 90 and less instead of at 100. Interest rates on Government loans have increased during the past few months. How long shall this continue? Are we going to raise this money by an additional bond issue? Are we going to put the Government further into debt? Are we going to increase the burden of Federal taxes?

Mr. Chairman, shall we say to the rest of the world, "We have advocated the balancing of the budgets by other nations, but when it comes to our own affairs we are not going to indulge in any such unpleasant practice?"

This House and the Committee on Appropriations of this House took great pride recently in the passage of the agricultural appropriation bill, in reducing the estimates that came from the Bureau of the Budget. Where was that reduction made? It was made principally out of the regular road-appropriation fund. We reduced the agricultural appropriation bill below the Budget estimate for the next fiscal year \$9,000,000 out of the road-appropriation fund. Prior to that we cut the Budget estimate for road building \$10,000,000 in the deficiency act. That was done under the pretense of economy yet you now come with this bill to add \$132,500,000 to the debt of the National Government for the purpose of doing the very thing which you refused to do in the deficiency and agricultural appropriation bills, even to the extent of \$19,000,000. Why, we even cut out \$1,000,000 in the Interior Department appropriation for public parks, roads, trails, and bridges, and lo and behold the item is restored in this bill for \$1,500,000, an increase of 50 per cent.

We have had so much talk about economy, so much talk about retrenchment in expenditures, and the House has given the Ways and Means Committee the distressing task of trying to raise an additional \$1,200,000,000 in a single year; but, despite all of that, you now bring before the House a resolution under which, by one fell swoop, you are not only adding to the burdens of the committee in trying to balance the Budget of the United States, but you are taking away even the small reductions in expenditures which have so far been perfected through the appropriations bills that have been passed by the House.

If there ever was a time to call a halt, it is to-day in the passage of this bill. [Applause.]

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON].

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, as I have only five minutes, I will be unable to yield for any questions.

I have been listening ever since this Congress convened to the very eloquent speeches by the leaders of the Democratic Party about the necessity of balancing the Budget and reducing the Government expenditures. I agree thoroughly with what the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] has said on Government economy. I agree with the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. DOUGLAS] and I also agree thoroughly with the statements of our able Speaker, the gentleman from Texas, when he pleads for a balanced Budget. And having all of these statements in mind, I am amazed therefore that this bill should have been brought out under a rule. It could not have received a rule if it had not been for the favorable consideration and advocacy of the Speaker.

In looking over the table I have before me, and which I will later insert in the RECORD, I am very much interested to note that the great State of Texas will receive 6.3 per cent of all of the money this bill proposes to authorize. In another table I have, which I will also insert, I notice that the contribution made by the State of Texas to the total Federal revenue, including income tax, corporation taxes, miscellaneous taxes, and so forth, is but 1.34 per cent. No wonder the Speaker and the State of Texas are in favor of this bill.

This week I took the opportunity of examining bills that have already been reported by the democratically controlled committees of this House. They provide for new Federal expenditures of over \$1,000,000,000; reported bills, mind you, not merely bills that have been introduced; bills that have been earnestly recommended to the House for passage. If the enthusiasm with which the Speaker and his fellow Democrats have brought this bill on the floor of the House is any criterion of what will happen on these other bills calling for over \$1,000,000,000 of new money, it is impossible for me to see how there will be any chance to begin to balance the Budget, which the Speaker and his chairman of the Appropriations Committee are so eloquently advocating.

But getting back to the bill before us, I wish to insert a table showing by States the total Federal taxes collected, which include income taxes, miscellaneous taxes, corporation taxes, and so forth, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and also showing the percentage of the total revenues that each State contributed. Customs receipts are, of course, excluded.

Following this table I wish now to insert another table comparing the apportionment of the \$120,000,000 road fund authorized by this bill with the proportionate amount assessable against each State in Federal taxes for the total Federal road fund under this same bill. The percentage of apportionment of the total road fund is also given as well as the percentage of the total Federal revenue collected on the basis of the fiscal year 1931.

Federal tax collections—Statement showing, by States, the amounts and percentages of total internal-revenue taxes collected, during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1931 (on a basis of warrants issued)

States	Total internal-revenue receipts	Percent of total
Alabama.....	\$4,622,236.13	0.18
Arizona.....	2,265,705.28	.09
Arkansas.....	1,914,565.04	.07
California.....	113,008,717.76	4.65
Colorado.....	15,772,615.89	.64
Connecticut.....	37,620,243.96	1.54
Delaware.....	34,054,473.55	1.39
District of Columbia.....	14,684,853.43	.60
Florida.....	11,512,120.90	.47
Georgia.....	6,721,313.18	.27
Hawaii.....	4,817,232.00	.19
Idaho.....	723,717.83	.02
Illinois.....	190,508,952.84	7.83
Indiana.....	21,411,023.38	.88
Iowa.....	10,400,342.42	.42
Kansas.....	13,685,503.29	.56
Kentucky.....	28,488,010.46	1.17
Louisiana.....	8,901,475.44	.36
Maine.....	6,759,533.93	.27
Maryland.....	30,293,310.73	1.24
Massachusetts.....	88,985,635.49	3.65
Michigan.....	107,411,851.17	4.41
Minnesota.....	23,387,171.46	.95

Federal tax collections—Statement showing, by States, the amounts and percentages of total internal-revenue taxes collected, during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1931 (on a basis of warrants issued)—Continued

States	Total internal-revenue receipts	Percent of total
Mississippi	\$1,584,433.15	0.03
Missouri	51,673,467.79	2.12
Montana	1,793,112.84	.07
Nebraska	4,784,060.24	.19
Nevada	1,365,238.65	.05
New Hampshire	3,554,107.76	.14
New Jersey	97,786,288.36	4.01
New Mexico	693,243.38	.02
New York	671,844,688.73	27.64
North Carolina	264,894,637.06	10.89
North Dakota	366,157.73	.01
Ohio	112,933,223.98	4.64
Oklahoma	14,948,982.99	.61
Oregon	4,431,097.52	.18
Pennsylvania	190,280,593.21	7.82
Rhode Island	11,267,592.05	.45
South Carolina	1,984,818.36	.08
South Dakota	751,270.97	.03
Tennessee	12,997,604.52	.53
Texas	32,791,128.98	1.34
Utah	2,381,319.62	.09
Vermont	1,751,711.20	.07
Virginia	113,654,648.84	4.67
Washington	11,533,484.51	.47
West Virginia	11,167,126.16	.45
Wisconsin	28,170,977.03	1.15
Wyoming	600,168.82	.24
Total	2,430,148,742.91	100.00

Amount each State would receive of the apportionment of \$120,000,000, together with percentage of each payment out of total apportionment fund, percentage which each State pays of all internal-revenue receipts, and proportion of internal-revenue taxes paid by each State to amount received under the bill

State	Amount apportioned to each State under bill	Per cent of apportionment	Per cent of total revenue collections	Proportionate amount assessable against each State, in taxes, for total Federal road fund under this bill
Alabama	\$2,550,053	2.0	0.18	\$216,000
Arizona	1,762,636	1.4	.09	108,000
Arkansas	2,091,431	1.6	.07	84,000
CALIFORNIA	4,669,711	3.8	4.65	5,680,000
Colorado	2,255,281	1.8	.64	368,000
CONNECTICUT	779,324	.6	1.54	1,813,000
DELAWARE	600,000	.5	1.39	1,668,000
Florida	1,629,204	1.3	.47	564,000
Georgia	3,120,191	2.6	.27	324,000
Idaho	1,508,485	1.25	.02	24,000
ILLINOIS	5,077,245	4.1	7.83	9,396,000
Indiana	3,060,265	2.5	.88	1,056,000
Iowa	3,173,493	2.6	.42	504,000
Kansas	3,276,334	2.6	.56	672,000
Kentucky	2,259,648	1.8	1.17	1,404,000
Louisiana	1,740,196	1.4	.36	432,000
Maine	1,070,600	.8	.27	324,000
MARYLAND	1,015,298	.8	1.24	1,488,000
MASSACHUSETTS	1,714,774	1.4	3.65	4,380,000
MICHIGAN	3,783,179	3.0	4.41	5,292,000
Minnesota	3,373,560	2.8	.95	1,140,000
Mississippi	2,160,628	1.8	.06	72,000
Missouri	3,761,014	3.0	2.12	2,544,000
Montana	2,525,108	2.0	.07	84,000
Nebraska	2,557,683	2.1	.19	228,000
Nevada	1,578,025	1.3	.05	60,000
New Hampshire	600,000	.5	.14	168,000
NEW JERSEY	1,659,121	1.3	4.01	4,812,000
New Mexico	1,962,340	1.6	.02	24,000
NEW YORK	6,067,965	5.0	27.64	33,168,000
NORTH CAROLINA	2,890,203	2.4	10.89	15,068,000
North Dakota	1,940,325	1.6	.01	12,000
OHIO	4,501,069	3.8	4.64	5,688,000
Oklahoma	2,893,101	2.4	.61	732,000
Oregon	1,966,128	1.7	.18	216,000
PENNSYLVANIA	5,261,052	4.3	7.82	9,384,000
Rhode Island	600,000	.5	.45	540,000
South Carolina	1,606,492	1.4	.08	96,000
South Dakota	2,002,076	1.7	.03	36,000
Tennessee	2,608,757	2.1	.53	636,000
Texas	7,068,024	6.3	1.34	1,608,000
Utah	1,387,190	1.2	.09	108,000
Vermont	600,000	.5	.07	84,000
VIRGINIA	2,258,196	1.9	4.67	5,604,000
Washington	1,905,627	1.6	.47	564,000
West Virginia	1,316,720	1.1	.45	540,000
Wisconsin	2,962,438	2.4	1.15	1,380,000
Wyoming	1,540,811	1.2	.24	288,000
Hawaii	600,000	.5	.19	228,000
Total	120,000,000	100.0	100.00	120,000,000

I call to your attention that there are 13 States of the 48 which have contributed in the year 1931 an astoundingly

greater percentage of the total Federal revenue than they will receive under the allotment of the \$120,000,000 we are to-day asked to authorize. These States are California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Virginia.

Mr. EATON of Colorado. Why did the gentleman omit Colorado? It amounts to \$15,000,000 on the one hand and \$2,000,000 on the other.

Mr. BACON. I did not yield to the gentleman, but will be glad to answer his question. It is quite true that the total contribution of the State of Colorado to Federal revenues, excluding customs, for the fiscal year 1931 is, to be accurate, \$15,772,615.89. This amount was 0.64 per cent of the total revenue received by the Federal Government. It is also true that Colorado under this bill would be apportioned \$2,255,281. This apportionment to Colorado is 1.8 per cent of the total of \$120,000,000. The gentleman entirely misses the significance of the table that I have been quoting from. I have been talking about the relative percentage of each State's apportionment under the bill in comparison with the relative percentage of the total revenue collected from each State, assessable against the cost of this bill. If the gentleman will refer to the table I have above inserted, I think the matter will be clear to him.

The 13 States which I have mentioned in the year 1931 provided 84.38 per cent of the total Federal revenue. Under this bill their proportion of road money will be but 32.9 per cent of the allotments that are proposed. This means that the remaining 35 States contribute but 15.62 per cent of the total Federal revenue, while receiving an allotment under this bill, as it is written, of 67.1 per cent of the \$120,000,000 total that is authorized.

New York, for example, contributes 27.64 per cent of the total revenue of the Federal Government, excluding customs. Under this bill New York's allotment of road funds is but 5 per cent of the \$120,000,000 total. Again, I call to your attention that the State of Texas receives 6.3 per cent. To put the matter in another way, the actual cash that will be contributed in Federal taxes by the State of New York for the purpose of this bill is, roughly, \$33,000,000, while the total cash which will be contributed by the State of Texas is but \$1,608,000. To put it even more flatly, New York, under this bill, is asked to contribute twenty times more than the State of Texas and receives over \$1,000,000 less.

It seems to me that this bill is an attempt on the part of the sparsely settled States to get additional Federal aid for the building of roads under the guise of relieving unemployment. If this were an honest attempt to relieve unemployment, the amounts authorized by this bill should be apportioned according to population and not acreage.

For example, the population of the State of New York is 12,588,066; the population of the State of Texas is 5,824,715. On the basis of population the State of New York will get a per capita apportionment of 48 cents as against \$1.30 for the State of Texas. We all concede there is more unemployment in the industrial than in the agricultural States, and especially in the larger cities, yet this bill does nothing or attempts nothing to relieve the unemployment there.

There is one further point to which I wish to call the attention of the committee, and that is that I have been discussing entirely that part of the bill which provides \$120,000,000 for Federal road aid to the States. I have not in any way discussed the \$12,000,000 allocated in this bill for expenditure in the national parks and Indian reservations. I have been informed, however, by the Bureau of Public Roads, that 90 per cent of this \$12,000,000 will be allocated to 11 western Rocky Mountain States. I further know, and only too well, that none of the industrial States, where the unemployment is the greatest, will receive one cent of this \$12,000,000.

There is one more thought that I have on this bill, namely, that the burden of maintenance of all Federal-aid roads rests entirely upon the States. The States will furthermore have to eventually match the amount apportioned to each State under this bill. These two items will add a

tremendous burden to the taxpayers of each State at a time when many States are having difficulty in balancing their budgets and at a time when the raising of additional taxes in each State is becoming an increasing and overbearing burden on the taxpayers. Therefore, in considering this bill, we must not only secure this money by increased Federal taxation, but each State will have to increase its taxation to meet its share of this sum and also have to increase its taxation to maintain the roads after they are built.

My own State of New York is having great difficulty in balancing its budget. They have appropriated large sums of money for the relief of unemployment among the people of New York and intend and will continue to take care of New York's own unemployed. With the burdens already on the State of New York in taking care of its own unemployment problem, the additional sum that they will be required to pay to match the amount allocated to New York may mean the raising of additional State taxes.

As I have already said above, if this were an honest attempt to relieve unemployment, the allotment of funds under this bill would have been apportioned in accordance with population rather than acreage, in which case there might have been afforded to the people of New York some aid in their unemployment problem. I will therefore support the amendment proposed to be offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KETCHAM], which, however, may go out on a point of order.

Mr. WARREN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BACON. I yield.

Mr. WARREN. Did not the gentleman and all of those who have preceded him on that side in opposition to this bill support a similar measure calling for an emergency fund of \$80,000,000 brought in by that side last year? Did not the gentleman himself vote for it?

Mr. BACON. I have forgotten whether I did or not. However, it is my impression that that was not a record vote. I have always viewed with disfavor these 50-50 matching propositions because not only have they tempted many States to incur expenditures which they could ill afford and which have greatly increased their taxpayers' burdens, but also because the benefits to the States contributing the most money have been out of all proportion to what they have received. And this is especially true when this matching is done on bases other than population. Particularly in view of the present huge deficit of over \$2,000,000,000, and the efforts that are being made to balance the Budget by cutting down Federal expenditures and the raising of over \$1,200,000,000 in additional revenue by taxation, I believe that this is a good time to stop contributions from the Federal Treasury to the several States. I therefore am opposing the bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGUARDIA].

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I regret exceedingly that in this instance I am not in accord with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York, who just addressed the committee.

The unemployment situation in this country, unfortunately, is so widespread and is so universal that relief of any kind anywhere reflects upon the general situation.

Mr. BACON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. BACON. Is it not true, though, that the greatest unemployment is in the metropolitan cities of this country and that this relief will not touch them at all?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Yes; but the gentleman from New York is not so provincial as not to be able to visualize that if we can give some of the workers of this country temporary road work at a living wage they will at least be able to buy some clothes, some shoes, and some food which we produce in our city.

Mr. BACON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Certainly.

Mr. BACON. I agree 100 per cent with what the gentleman has said, but if this were an honest unemployment-relief bill, should it not be apportioned according to population rather than area?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Well, that is a detail which we can take up when we are reading the bill. I would favor such an apportionment. I want to say to all of my friends I would like to see how many votes we could get in this House if we brought in an honest-to-goodness unemployment-relief measure. This is what I have been driving for ever since we came into session—for this Congress, now that the first dole bill has been passed by Congress and signed by the President—I refer to the billion dollar relief bill—to give some immediate attention to direct relief to the millions of people who are actually in want in this country at this very moment.

There is no longer any question of constitutionality that may be properly raised at this time. The constitutional limitations of the power of Congress, so far as this Congress is concerned, is expressed in the Finance Reconstruction Corporation bill. Show me the constitutionality for that and I am ready to argue the constitutionality of any other relief measure which may be considered, including direct relief and unemployment insurance.

Of course, there are no Federal-aid highways in my city, but that is no justification to vote against this measure. Why, this bill is the first indication, it is the first attempt, it is the first color of any legislative action on the part of the House of Representatives to get right to the spot where relief is needed. [Applause.]

The engineering plans will not take long. The States can avail themselves of the benefits of this bill. Appropriations ought to be immediately made, and if we can put several hundred thousand men to work on the roads, this means that many relieved from the humiliation of standing in the breadline.

I get very impatient with this ostrich-like tendency on the part of alleged statesmen to refuse to admit existing facts. The stock ticker of my city is no indication of the employment situation throughout the country. There is unemployment, there is want, there is need, and we have been talking so much about public improvement and public works as a constructive means to provide employment that I am surprised that in this feeble attempt to carry out such a program that there should be any objection at all. This is only a little move toward a step in the right direction. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SUMMERS].

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this bill. I am opposed to a dole, but I do ardently favor honest employment for honest laboring men, and I believe that road work will give more labor per dollar expended than any other projects that may be undertaken.

There are many good features in this bill. There is one additional feature that I want to talk to you about—an amendment which I believe would still further improve the bill. Many of you have heard of the so-called Summers farm-to-market post road bill (H. R. 137), which I shall offer as an amendment. You can get it in the document room and learn the details, if you wish. It proposes to extend aid 50-50 to States, counties, or subdivisions to build rural post roads, farm-to-market roads, which are now untouched in any way by any legislation that has been enacted.

It is believed that this farm-to-market post road amendment contains more good points than any legislation yet proposed for the purpose of building rural roads and giving employment. My amendment specifies that due consideration shall be given roads which shall best serve the agricultural needs of the country in obtaining access to the Federal road system, rail and water shipping points, and markets.

The measure is indorsed unanimously by the rural letter carriers of the United States; it is indorsed by the organization of rural carriers in your State and in your county; it

is indorsed in principle by the National Grange, by the Farm Bureau, by innumerable local organizations, such as farmer organizations and chambers of commerce, because it helps to lift the farmer out of the mud and helps him to get to town in order that he may carry on his trading and market his products.

It does not call for any particular machinery or for shipping in materials from some other place. It proposes in two days' time to send men out with picks and shovels and scrapers in your county and mine and let them go to work. These are men who are now in the soup line. It will distribute the small burden of cost over more than 3,000 counties and to the National Government. It will inaugurate a practical nation-wide road-building program, and it will utilize home products and home labor exclusively.

It will relieve the jobless. It will give men in every county of the United States who want to work an opportunity to work. It will curtail the soup line. It will put idle men to work and thereby reduce crime. It will require the outlay of not one needless dollar. If approved, it can be put into operation immediately.

It is not proposed to build boulevards or speedways, under the amendment which I shall offer to the bill, but to improve much-used roads right down to the old farm gate, at an expense on the average of about \$2,000 a mile instead of \$30,000 a mile as concrete roads now cost.

Mr. HOGG of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Yes, briefly.

Mr. HOGG of Indiana. I think the gentleman is on the right track. Will the gentleman support an amendment which I shall offer to this bill requiring the loading of this dirt and the excavating and grading to be done by shovel instead of steam machinery?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I shall take that under consideration.

Now, gentlemen, I am calling your attention to the fact that you can get the amendment that I shall offer, H. R. 137, in the document room. I introduced H. R. 137, the farm-to-market post road bill, December 8. The first hour after Congress convened. I reiterate, that it is indorsed by the rural letter carriers and farm organizations, and by commercial organizations all over the United States.

Mr. Chairman, my bill which I offer as an amendment may be rejected to-day, but we shall carry on until it is enacted into law. It is right, it is just, it will serve the masses. You may defeat it to-day, but ultimately it must win. It serves the rural carrier and the masses of the farmers. We shall carry this fight to the country and on its merit we shall finally win and lift the farmer and rural carrier out of the mud and give them some of the advantages the tourist now enjoys.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. UNDERHILL].

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, you have heard a good deal about who is going to pay for this, but I do not believe any figures have been presented to show the fallacy and sophistry of the employment argument.

I have figures and facts as to that feature. Massachusetts increased appropriations for roads from \$12,800,000 in 1930 to \$17,350,000 in 1931, making an increase of \$4,550,000 for that year.

Now, in 1930 and 1931 the peak of employment on road construction in that State was 5,632 men, and the minimum employed during that same period was 300 men, or an average in 1930 of 2,100, and an average in 1931 of 2,900 men, an increase of employment in 1931 of 800 men, by the expenditure of \$4,550,000 on road work at an average daily wage of less than \$4 per day. Now, take \$135,000,000, which we propose to appropriate, and divide it at this ratio, and you will find that you are going to give employment in road construction for 2,600 to 2,700 men now unemployed.

The material that goes into the construction of roads is largely steel and cement. I do not know how many of you have steel or cement factories in your districts, and I do not know just what proportion of this one hundred and

thirty-two million is going to the employment of labor in the steel and cement factories. But, if you are going to talk about local employment, realize how many you are going to get of the 2,600 or 2,700 men at work. Also consider that the greatest suffering to-day is not among the men who can use the pick and shovel, but the white-collared men who have lost their jobs, and imagine how far you will get when you send those men out on the road with a pick and shovel, with their tender hands and body unused to hard physical labor.

This proposition for the relief of unemployment is a great mass of contradictions and sophistry, which does not deserve the attention of this body.

Now, gentlemen, placing 2,600 men at work, putting them into employment, would be some little relief, but at the price of \$135,000,000, the price is too high, with the deficit we have to meet. [Applause.]

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. The way we build roads in the State of Washington, more than that total number of idle men will be employed.

Mr. UNDERHILL. If we are going to pass a bill we ought to pass a bill similar to the one that the gentleman introduced, but we are considering this bill, not his. If we are going to consider and pass this bill, I want it done with the knowledge each Member will get employment for about one man in your whole district.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. PURNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. McGUGIN].

Mr. McGUGIN. Mr. Chairman, this Congress can not and will not enact a single bill during this session which is loaded down with more asininity and inequality than this bill which we are considering to-day. No one insists for one moment that there is any imperative need from the standpoint of building highways for this appropriation. The sole justification offered for it is unemployment.

When we consider this measure solely from an unemployment viewpoint, it is then that we realize its asininity and its inequality. When the chairman of the Roads Committee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ALMON], appeared before the Rules Committee he made the extravagant estimate that 1,000,000 men would be given employment through this legislation. He stated that 300,000 would be the number that would be directly employed. He then estimated that indirectly 700,000 more would be employed. Of course, the number which are to be indirectly employed is to be limited only by an unbridled imagination. Personally, I am quite convinced that it is extravagant, advertising deceit upon the part of Congress to say that this legislation will furnish employment for a million men; however, let us grant that it will furnish employment for 1,000,000 of the unemployed, it is then that we realize the asininity and the inequality of this bill. If it furnishes employment for a million men, then that means \$132.50 worth of employment per man. Well, what are you going to do with these men after the \$132.50 apiece is expended?

There are eight and one-half million unemployed. Which million are you going to pick out and deliver from the despair of unemployment and which seven and one-half million are you going to leave in their present slough of despondency? I can go out on the highway, pick up any unfortunate hitch hiker, and from him I shall receive the same statesmanship as is involved in this bill. He will doubtless suggest that he should be taken care of by the Public Treasury. That statesmanship would not work. It is utterly impossible for the Public Treasury to feed the unemployed. The theory of this bill is to furnish work for the unemployed out of the Public Treasury. That, too, is utterly impossible. This bill clearly proves the situation. Its most fanatical advocates concede that it will take care of only a million men and that to the extent of only \$132.50 a man. If this Government is going to endeavor to take care of unemployment by public works, then it must have the decency to be as fair with all the citizens as it is to one. If we are going to give work to one million men, we must give work to eight and one-half million men.

If we are going to give work to eight and one-half million men, this appropriation should be increased from \$132,500,000 to \$1,146,250,000.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WARREN] justifies this bill with the explanation that the States individually can not build the roads but assumes that the 48 States collectively can build them. One would not think that a Representative from North Carolina, a State which traditionally believes in State sovereignty, would present the childish suggestion that 48 States collectively can financially do that which 48 States individually can not do.

The Government at this time is running behind \$2,000,000,000 a year. Just yesterday I heard the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] state that the Ways and Means Committee had exhausted every effort to tax the large incomes, and yet there is no way of balancing the Budget except to take on the sales tax. Personally, I regard the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] as one of the outstanding statesmen of this House. I am basing that statement primarily upon the address which Mr. CRISP gave in the House a week or two since demanding a balancing of the Budget.

This morning the press reports are that the Democratic floor leader of this House, Mr. RAINEY, of Illinois, takes the position that a sales tax is imperative. When we turn to the sales tax, every State and every individual proportionately pays an equal part of the tax burden. If the money to meet this appropriation were collected from the large incomes, I would accept this bill upon the theory that it is one way of getting back into the rural communities the money which is daily drained away from them by monopoly; however, since the Ways and Means Committee has exhausted every effort through the income-tax route, yet there is a deficit, and to meet that deficit it must turn to the sales tax, that means that this appropriation will be paid equally by the States and the people of the Republic. Since the sales tax is to furnish the additional money to balance the Budget, then that means that every new appropriation will be met by the sales tax rather than by the income tax collected from the large estates.

It is admitted that the States can no longer meet their tax burden and it is common knowledge that property and farms are being confiscated by taxes. If we collect a sales tax from the people, who own the real estate in the States, upon every thing which they eat and wear, then they will have only that much less money with which to pay their property taxes. It would be the same result if we were directly increasing the property taxes of the country in order to meet this appropriation.

If this Congress will lay aside its socialistic statesmanship and will be willing to reach the unemployment problem in a practical and permanent way, then I suggest two propositions: First, lend its good offices in forcing the shortening of the hours of labor from eight hours to six hours a day, that will increase the employment of this country 25 per cent; and second, then if we must make some appropriations to assist the unemployed, let us go along with the financial institutions of this country in some sort of a program to provide liberal credit for two or three million of the unemployed to get back to the small farm. Sooner or later many of our unemployed must return to the farms as millions went from the farms to the factories when we had the markets of the world for manufactured products. At that time our European competitors were at war. To-day our European competitors are back in the markets of the world and have regained their lost markets. Our exports for December were the lowest of any month since before the war in 1914. As millions of men went from the farms to the factories, when we had the markets of the world, it is obvious that millions of men must go from the factories to the small farm, since we no longer have the markets of the world.

If we try to solve unemployment by public works or by direct donations, we are following the precepts of socialism and communism. All there is to communism is that everyone works for the government; therefore the government must have all of the income. If we are going to give to one-eighth of the unemployed work for a few weeks by the proc-

ess of a little pinch of communism, we may as well reconcile ourselves to the fact that sooner or later we are going to have to take on more communism, giving eight and one-half times as many men employment and make the employment permanent instead of temporary. When we have eight and one-half million men permanently working for the Government we shall have communism and nothing less. Let us throw off the mask of hypocrisy, look the matter squarely in the face, and either decide to solve our social problems by taking on communism in its true form or let us gird ourselves to the situation and meet our present ills in the traditionally American and Anglo-Saxon way. It is either the case of balancing the Budget or ultimately communism. There is no escaping it.

This bill does not solve unemployment. It does not even alleviate unemployment. It is only a raid on the Public Treasury in the name of unemployment. If it has any justification, that justification is political. Its only purpose can be for the Members of this Congress to use it as a deceitful thing to pacify the distressed unemployed. It may pacify them long enough for us to get by the next election. If we must spend some money to perpetuate ourselves in office, let us have the manhood to furnish our own campaign expenses rather than to bleed the Public Treasury.

If I did not believe that unemployment could be solved in the traditionally American way, I would not only be in favor of this bill but I would be in favor of multiplying it many-fold. I would be in favor of taking on communism. Unemployment must be solved. We must face it and accept it. I think that our unemployment ills can be solved by shortening the hours of labor and getting a part of the surplus industrial labor back to the small farm. I think this is the traditionally American Anglo-Saxon way to relieve unemployment.

For my part, I am going to vote against this and all other raids on the Public Treasury to solve our economic problem. I shall vote against it and continue to live in the despairing hope that sooner or later the political, the financial, the industrial, and the social leadership of this country will recognize the necessity of shortening the hours of labor to take up the slack brought about by the use of modern machinery, and of getting the men back to the small farm who formerly worked in the factory when we had all the export markets of the world.

If this Congress really wants to do something effective for unemployment, it can within a week's time put three men to work permanently for every man this bill would put to work temporarily. This Congress will not have to follow the precepts of socialism. It can carry out a program which is traditionally American.

I refer to the great opportunity of this Congress to protect the American fuel market for American coal, the American oil market for American oil, and the American copper market for American copper. Give us a tariff on imported oil and you will preserve the American fuel market for American coal and the American oil market for American oil. That will permanently put to work 400,000 unemployed men in the oil and coal fields, and at the ratio of 300,000 directly employed and 700,000 indirectly employed, as suggested by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ALMON], the advocating of this bill would mean that these 400,000 men put back to work in the American oil and coal industries would carry with them 900,000 more men back to employment. This would be 1,300,000 men employed permanently and indefinitely. They would not be discharged just as soon as they had earned \$132.50. The employment of this number of men would bring some permanent prosperity to the country, and the country would be better able to pay taxes with which to build roads or other public improvements. I do not know how many men would be permanently restored to employment if you would protect the American copper market for American copper. It is safe to say that thousands of men now unemployed in the copper industry would be returned to employment.

I would not oppose this bill and I would not oppose socialism if I did not believe that we could follow in the foot-

steps of our patriotic and fearless forbears, and do more to relieve unemployment than we can ever do to relieve it by following such socialistic measures as this one. I call upon the Congress to be statesmanlike and manly and look to programs which are traditionally American, which are sound and will furnish relief which is permanent and lasting. [Applause.]

Mr. PURNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, the bill which is before us to-day purports to be an emergency measure for the purpose of furnishing employment to the unemployed. There has been much discussion concerning the number of men to be given employment if this bill becomes effective. It is ridiculous to say that with \$120,000,000 to be expended for highway purposes that 1,000,000 men can receive any appreciable amount of employment. So far as furnishing employment is concerned, this bill is a farce. This is referred to as emergency legislation. Surely there can be no emergency so far as building additional roads is concerned, especially in forests, parks, and on Indian reservations. Therefore if the bill fails as an emergency measure, so far as employment is concerned, it loses all its force and effect. The people of the country are demanding economy. That sage of wits, Will Rogers, has suggested to Congress that whenever we appropriate any money that we carry in the same bill a provision providing for the raising of the money. We can not have economy by pinching, scraping, and paring in the Appropriations Committee and reporting out unwarranted legislation from other committees. When the agricultural appropriation bill was up we cut out certain appropriations for the expansion of roads and claimed credit for cutting the appropriation bill. I see my friend and colleague from Michigan [Mr. HART], who is a member of the Agricultural Subcommittee on Appropriations, is present. He insisted on cutting down those appropriations and was correct in so doing. We also eliminated roads in the parks and Government reservations when the Interior appropriation bill was before Congress. We went to the country with the statement that we had reduced these appropriation bills, and yet under the misnomer of emergency we are to-day undoing everything we have done in the way of reductions in appropriation bills. There is a difference between economizing for the purpose of reducing taxes and economizing for the purposes of publicity. However, be assured that the taxpayers of the country will not be deceived.

Mr. HART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes.

Mr. HART. Is not this bill simply using Federal funds to match Federal funds we appropriated under the agricultural appropriation bill?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes; this bill is asking the States to tax their people to raise money to pay more money for Federal roads. Every time we pass one of these 50-50 bills offering to give the States something for nothing we not only invite the States, but we urge the States, to place more taxes on the backs of their people, for the sole purpose of getting something for nothing. [Applause.] This is the bait that is held out to get Members from States to support this kind of legislation and the list which Mr. PURNELL will publish is presumed to have sufficient potentiality to garner a sufficient number of votes. While it is true that Michigan will get more than \$3,000,000 of this money, yet she will pay into the Treasury of the United States as Federal revenue much more than this amount. In other words, Michigan would be much further ahead of the game if she kept her own money in the State and built her own roads. Our tax burden up there is almost unbearable and we do not want additional roads which must be paid for by the taxpayers—not for the present at least.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] spoke for this bill. He is a member of the committee and understands the motives of the committee. He made this state-

ment in substance: "I want you people to understand that this bill is not for the purpose of sidetracking any other relief legislation." He tells us that this is to be followed by the Costigan-La Follette bill, and by other similar bills. He says that this is just one step, this is one item. We have heard it whispered about the floor of the House that the purpose of this so-called relief bill is to block something worse, and that this is a reason why those who are opposed to the Federal dole and legislation of that type should vote for this legislation. This reason does not appeal to me at all. This bill, if enacted into law, is a framework on which can be grafted many more expensive propositions when the bill reaches the Senate. I do not want legislation of this type written in conference. It is easy and appealing to talk about our unfortunate people and to appeal in behalf of "starving millions." Personally, I do not believe there are "starving millions" in the United States. There is undoubtedly distress and hardship, yet I have too much faith in our local communities and American patriotism to believe that these local communities are at this time permitting their fellow-citizens to starve.

Every dollar received by the States under this legislation requires additional State taxation. It is true that a part of this appropriation, if used by the States, would not have to be repaid by the States until after the year 1938, but we are assuming a burden, which some day, somehow, must be paid by the folks back home, and let us have the courage to stop this spending right here and now. The Committee on Ways and Means is exerting every effort to find enough money to pay the running expenses of the Government. Our Committee on Appropriations lops off five or ten millions and to-day we add \$132,500,000—more than we can hope to save through the efforts of the Appropriations Committee. We are all for improved roads, when we can afford them, but we can not afford them at present, and the benefits to be derived from additional employment as hoped for in this legislation are far outweighed by the actual injury of additional appropriations and added taxation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. KEMP].

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, there has been, in my opinion, a great misunderstanding of not only the purpose of the bill but the effect of it. The objection urged against the passage of the bill because it would interfere with balancing the Budget overlooks the very nature of the thing that will be accomplished by the expenditure of this money. This is not a current expense, it is not the expending of \$132,000,000, but it is a capital investment; it is purchasing that thing which will endure for the happiness, convenience, and the benefit of all the people of all this broad land. It goes into the years to come and its service will continue. It must not be considered as a current expense. It is something that the people want. It is something that the American people will enjoy; and it is an investment that is being made at a time when the greatest possible economy can be practiced in the acquisition of this capital investment. Has there ever been a time since 1914 when so much road could be bought for the same amount of money? Labor, materials, and everything are reduced to-day and we will get more road for our money than ever before.

I want to insist that this House bear in mind that this is an investment of a permanent character and not an ordinary current expense. I am surprised that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] would object to the expenditure of money for good roads. Does the gentleman not know—and do we not all know—that had it not been for the establishment of Federal aid for road building in 1916 we would not have had the great system of good roads that we have in this country? Does the gentleman not know that without that system of good roads we would not have had the great automobile industry in this country, which is now the greatest single industry in the whole United

States? Does not the gentleman know that without the growth and expansion of the automobile industry during the last decade this country would not have enjoyed the unprecedented, marvelous, and unbelievable prosperity that came to this country during that period? Does not the gentleman know that had not the automobile industry, which was new, absorbed three or four million men, we would have had in this country the same widespread unemployment that prevailed in Great Britain and other foreign countries?

The Bureau of Public Roads states, through its chief, that there are presently 3,000,000 men engaged in road construction in the United States. We are also informed that this year there will be \$264,000,000 less for road construction in the United States than was available for 1931. That makes it very important that we provide this \$132,000,000.

I also wish to submit to the House some figures that were furnished me this morning as to the number of people that this fund will employ. These figures are furnished by the Bureau of Public Roads. Mr. McDonald said that this fund provided in this bill would build 15,000 miles of roads; that from 80 to 90 per cent of the road dollar goes to the road-building personnel—to labor and personnel; that the emergency appropriation will keep from 80,000 to 90,000 men employed for one year.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Chairman, I yield eight minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, unemployment is more serious and widespread than ever before in the history of the country. The American Federation of Labor estimates that at present 8,300,000 people are out of work.

No one measure will completely solve the question. It is universally conceded that public works provide employment. During depressions, repairs and building are always urged. I know of no public work that provides more widely distributed employment in all the States of the Union than highway construction. Road building has contributed much to the relief of unemployment in the past two years. Highway programs have been adopted in New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, and other States to relieve unemployment. The State Highway Commissioner of Michigan estimated that a \$10,000,000 road-construction program in that State would provide winter employment for approximately 30,000 workers.

We are entering the third year of unemployment in the existing depression, and many States of necessity will decrease appropriations for road construction. There are universal deficits in States, counties, and cities. There is no market for highway bonds. There is a tendency to divert the gasoline tax from road building to other purposes. Many States are and will be unable to match Federal-aid highway funds.

On December 9, 1930, upon the recommendation of President Hoover, and by a unanimous-consent agreement, without previous legislative authorization, under the leadership of the Republicans then in control, with a majority of about 100, the House passed H. R. 14804, appropriating \$80,000,000 to enable the States to match Federal-aid highway funds in aid of unemployment. The Democratic minority cooperated in the passage of the measure.

THE BILL

The main provisions of the bill under consideration are substantially the provisions of the emergency act of December, 1930. The funds authorized are to be apportioned as temporary advances to the States. They may be used as State funds on Federal highway projects, but primarily the sums advanced are to be used to match the regular Federal-aid apportionments.

There are two constructive features that did not occur in the emergency act of December, 1930. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make rules and regulations for carrying out the provisions of the act, with the view of providing the maximum employment of local labor, consistent with reasonable economy of construction, and in those

States where 90 per cent of the Federal-aid highways have been completed, 1 per cent may be added to the 7 per cent now provided by law.

The bill was carefully considered by the committee. Hearings were conducted thereon, and the legislative authorization must be followed by an appropriation. There is no merit in the criticism that the bill was hastily drawn or considered.

INCREASES EMPLOYMENT

We are considering the first measure to increase employment that has reached the floor of the House this session. It is universally conceded that there is more unemployment now than in December, 1930. The pending bill contains an authorization of \$120,000,000, whereas the legislation of December, 1930, provided \$80,000,000. The measure is entirely logical. With more unemployment, more money is provided for relief.

The Democrats are now in control of the House by a bare majority. With no constructive suggestions and with no alternative program, those representing the Republican minority have suddenly announced their opposition to the pending bill. Many have spoken against it. Those who advocated identically the same emergency measure in December, 1930, now oppose the pending measure.

President Hoover on December 4, 1930, transmitted a Budget estimate to Congress asking for the \$80,000,000 emergency appropriation for highway construction to relieve unemployment. So eager was the Republican organization to comply with the President's request, the usual procedure was not followed. The matter was not considered by the legislative Committee on Roads. The measure was brought before the House by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wood], then chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. He requested and obtained unanimous consent for consideration of the emergency measure. Not a single Republican or Democrat then opposed it. The distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wood] not only sponsored the identical legislation a little more than a year ago, but he announced that its purpose was to aid unemployment. For this purpose he advocated it. He has just spoken in opposition to the pending measure.

OPPOSITION

Notwithstanding his advocacy of the moratorium, notwithstanding his advocacy of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation legislation, the gentleman argues that the pending measure ought to be defeated to relieve the taxpayers. He is not only inconsistent, he has not only turned about face, but he offers no explanation for his changed position. He even went so far, in December, 1930, as to congratulate the Democratic minority upon their cooperation in passing that measure. I confess that there is always apparent effort when the distinguished gentleman makes acknowledgment to the Democrats, but to show not only his inconsistency but his change of position without rhyme or reason I quote from the gentleman's statement on the floor of the House when he championed the highway emergency legislation in aid of unemployment in 1930, as follows:

And I wish now to express my appreciation of the part the Democratic Members took in formulating this bill.

It may be remarked that the pending measure is before the House with the unanimous report of the Committee on Roads and with the unanimous approval of the Committee on Rules.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. PURNELL] likewise opposes the pending measure. He was thoroughly satisfied that \$80,000,000 could be spent on the Federal-aid highways and that unemployment would be relieved a year ago, but he is among the doubting Thomases now. He is uncertain. He opposes the pending bill without the slightest reason for his position. He does manifest his anxiety for the unemployment situation, but he neither offers nor proposes any solution. Without any remedy he is content to obstruct. It does not disturb him in the least that he has completely reversed his former position.

It was reserved to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM], representing, in part, the second largest city in the United States, to bring up the heavy oratorical artillery in opposition to the only measure in aid of unemployment thus far considered. He opposes the first bill in aid of unemployment, although he stood loyally by the identical program a year ago and supported faithfully President Hoover in enacting the program. While opposing highway aid, the statesman from Illinois takes occasion to advocate another strain on the Treasury in an effort to balance the Budget. He almost sheds tears as he thinks of appropriating money for building roads, which are to be used by the people of the entire country, but he waxes eloquent in advocacy of an appropriation to build houses and construct offices in the great cities of the country. It is difficult for some statesmen to see beyond the municipal limits of the cities in which they live. The gentleman from Illinois speaks of balancing the Budget. He opposes the pending measure, but he advocates no other form of relief. He neglected to speak of balancing the Budget when he approved billions of dollars for the banks, railways, and other financial institutions of the country, but when it comes to aiding the unemployed in the only relief measure thus far considered on the floor of the House, he becomes gravely and profoundly concerned about balancing the Budget. He is a member of the Ways and Means Committee. He knows full well that when we speak of balancing the Budget we refer to the fiscal year 1933. The passage of the pending bill will not interfere with balancing the Budget. Appropriations made under it, like appropriations for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and for other similar purposes, will not in and of themselves increase the taxes in balancing the Budget for 1933. The appropriations for 1932 will be passed to the public debt. All emergency appropriations will tend to increase the public debt, but will not materially interfere with balancing the Budget. The moratorium was passed primarily to aid the rehabilitation of Germany and to help our former allies. We can not afford to do less than pass the pending measure in aid of the unemployed in our own land. [Applause.]

The opposition of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON] is typical. Under the leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt, the distinguished Governor of the Empire State, relief programs have been adopted in that State; however, the gentleman from New York is not bothered about consistency. He advocates no measure of relief for the unemployed. In fact, he makes no reference in his speech opposing the pending bill to unemployment at all. I dismiss his opposition by calling attention to the fact that he does not know whether he supported the identical legislation a little more than a year ago. He actually stated that he had forgotten whether he supported it or not.

Of course, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], as was to be expected, gave us the benefit of his views in making vocal his opposition to the pending relief measure. Frequently constructive in his suggestions, the gentleman was probably louder in his denunciation of the pending bill than any other Republican who spoke in opposition to it. He is usually careful and painstaking, but he completely overlooked any sort of explanation of his reversal of the position taken by the Republican administration on identically the same bill just a year ago. In his zeal the gentleman from Michigan referred to the commendable economy of the present Democratic leadership in the House; however, he erroneously stated that the regular Federal-aid road appropriation was deliberately cut in the current agricultural appropriation bill.

As I have already stated, many States are unable to match the Federal aid. The Agricultural Committee evidently had this in mind, and as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN] stated more than once during the consideration of the annual appropriation for regular Federal aid to highways, there was no reduction in fact, and every dollar that Mr. Thomas H. MacDonald, Chief of the Bureau of Public Roads stated could be used in 1933, was appropriated. Moreover,

the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM] evidently do not recall that the former emergency road appropriation of \$80,000,000 contained a stipulation that one-fifth of the \$80,000,000 was to be deducted from the apportionment to the several States for the five years commencing with 1933. That provision accounts for the reduction in the annual highway appropriation.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL] and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] have made known their opposition to the pending bill, although they were solicitous, as shown by the discussions, for the passage of identically the same bill in December, 1930. These gentlemen are evidently laboring under the delusion that the unemployment situation in Illinois and Washington is not as acute as it was in 1930.

REPUDIATION

Federal-aid highway appropriations have been increased from \$75,000,000 to \$125,000,000 in the past two years. Public buildings in the cities costing hundreds of millions of dollars have been authorized under the administration of President Hoover and upon the advocacy of the Republican majority in the House during his term, largely in aid of unemployment. The country was prosperous in 1928. Bankruptcy stalks abroad in the land now. Unemployment obtains in the city and the country. The Republican minority in the House criticizes but offers no solution. I point to the significant fact that every Member who has spoken in opposition to the pending bill offered no remedy for the unprecedented unemployment. The opposition involves not only an admitted and unexplained inconsistency but a shameful repudiation of the program of the President of the United States and a repudiation of the adoption of that program by the Republican majority in control of the House in December, 1930. [Applause.]

MONEY

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD] opposes the expenditure under the pending bill because it involves the appropriation of money. I ask him and all who concur in his opinion how they intend to relieve unemployment unless money is provided. People are begging for work, and money is essential if work is to be paid for. No self-executing program has been suggested. I repeat that neither the gentleman from Indiana nor any other person in Congress can suggest any program to relieve unemployment unless it involves the expenditure of money. [Applause.]

WORKERS

Much has been said during the discussion about the number of workers employed in highway construction. I shall not quibble about figures. The view is general that from 75 per cent to 80 per cent, and possibly 90 per cent, of the money expended for highway construction is ultimately paid out as wages and salaries. I make this statement upon the authority of the Bureau of Public Roads. The matter was developed in the hearings. Mr. MacDonald, the Chief of the Bureau of Public Roads, stated that the percentage ranged all the way from 15 to 80 per cent, depending upon the type of the work. For modern pavements 15 to 20 per cent goes to labor on the job. Eventually most of the money goes back to labor. In the hearings before the Post Offices and Post Roads Committee of the United States Senate in January, 1932, Mr. MacDonald inserted a statement showing the distribution of \$910 out of every \$1,000 in highway construction for wages and salaries. Moreover, before the committee of the House in the hearings on the pending bill, as well as in said hearings before the Senate committee, Mr. MacDonald stated that for highway State and Federal employment there was an average of 288,000 workers for each month of the year 1931.

The use of man power and the elimination of machinery wherever and whenever economical and consistent are encouraged by the rules to be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture. Whatever may be said about the number

employed, I challenge any opponent of the pending bill to point out any expenditure of Government funds that will provide for more general employment than aid to Federal highways. I also challenge any such opponent to name any legislation from which the general public will receive more direct benefits.

PUBLIC WORKS

Donations from the Public Treasury are decried. The dole is denounced. Work is the remedy for unemployment. We must be national in our point of view. The cities profit from the construction of public buildings. The country is benefited by the building of roads. Those who represent the sparsely settled States are asking no special favors. They are advocating a national program for public works that will benefit the industrial workers of the city and the laborers of the country.

I advocate the broad and liberal view. Harbors are improved, with direct benefit to the cities located thereon. I advocate appropriations for improving harbors. The representatives of the cities advocate aid to banks, railways, life-insurance companies, and shipping companies. I gladly support all reasonable measures for these purposes, but in support of these measures I ask my friends from the great cities to reciprocate. I commend the view and the statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MEAD], for he admits that there is the problem of unemployment in both the country and the city.

If Congress is not to adopt the dole, then all appropriations to aid unemployment involve construction of some kind. If those who advocate relief for unemployment oppose highway construction, they should submit a better program of relief. It will be difficult for the country to understand the complete change of front and the utter repudiation of that program for unemployment that was proclaimed by President Hoover and his defenders as sound in December, 1930.

LOCAL LABOR AND REASONABLE WAGES

I favor a reasonable wage scale, and I am also in favor of the employment of American citizens on all public works. At the same time, I favor regular aid for highways. One of the dangers in Federal aid is the tendency to centralize.

The States contribute 50 per cent. They should have the final voice in the expenditure of the funds. Federal aid provides, under our dual form of government, for the distribution of income equitably among the States for national purposes. The laws of the States with respect to labor and public works control in highway construction. Contracts are made subject to State laws. I therefore oppose any further Federal legislation that will take away from the States power and authority in the distribution of the funds and in the execution of the works. I oppose further bureaucracy and advocate local sovereignty in Federal aid.

RELIEF

Did the emergency highway program in 1931 actually give relief? Every dollar of the emergency appropriation was allocated and used. New York, Indiana, and Michigan, as well as every other State in the Union, used every cent of the emergency appropriation allocated to them. The relief under the previous emergency act came to every State in the Union. No time-serving or political opposition can controvert successfully the undisputed fact that employment was promoted by the previous emergency appropriation.

EMERGENCY

I want to say a word about the present necessity for the legislation. The revenues of the States have decreased. As I have pointed out, the funds for highway construction will be materially less in many States during the current year. Many heretofore employed on highways will be without work. There is the problem to maintain those who are at present employed. Moreover, with the difficulties of balancing State budgets for the current year, where a different plan of financing obtains from that in the Federal Government, the taxes on gasoline are being diverted to pay other obligations. Highway construction will lag. The States will be without money to match the regular Federal aid in 1933. Passage of the pending bill will make available, therefore, without local contribution, approximately \$250,000,000, for immediate highway construction.

Under the leave to extend my remarks I insert the following table furnished me by the Bureau of Public Roads, showing the unobligated balance of Federal-aid funds available for new projects as of January 31, 1932:

Unobligated balance of Federal-aid funds available for new projects as of January 31, 1932

State	1931 ¹ apportionment		1932 apportionment		1933 apportionment		Total unobligated balance
	Balance unobligated	Per cent	Balance unobligated	Per cent	Balance unobligated	Per cent	
Alabama	\$523,516.31	20.1	\$2,615,434.00	100.0	\$2,250,169.00	100.0	\$5,389,119.31
Arizona					1,491,162.58	95.8	1,491,162.58
Arkansas			145,274.44	6.7	1,846,477.60	100.0	1,991,752.04
California					1,804,409.96	43.8	1,804,409.96
Colorado			78,617.08	3.4	1,988,953.60	100.0	2,067,570.68
Connecticut			25,850.34	3.3	687,401.80	100.0	713,252.14
Delaware					338,081.68	63.9	338,081.68
Florida	41,364.63	2.7	1,543,232.00	100.0	1,437,372.40	100.0	3,021,969.03
Georgia					1,744,179.93	63.3	1,744,179.93
Idaho			93,032.58	6.0	1,330,448.00	100.0	1,423,480.58
Illinois					2,905,293.87	64.9	2,905,293.87
Indiana					1,584,606.30	58.7	1,584,606.30
Iowa					1,973,117.19	70.5	1,973,117.19
Kansas					1,760,691.19	60.9	1,760,691.19
Kentucky					1,727,826.78	86.7	1,727,826.78
Louisiana			129,078.92	7.4	1,537,800.60	100.0	1,666,879.52
Maine			374,803.23	33.4	944,168.20	100.0	1,318,971.43
Maryland					785,651.09	87.7	785,651.09
Massachusetts					687,103.02	45.5	687,103.02
Michigan					3,168,443.32	94.9	3,168,443.32
Minnesota					150,028.10	5.0	150,028.10
Mississippi	1,266,530.71	57.2	2,209,509.00	100.0	1,907,440.80	100.0	5,383,500.51
Missouri					3,047,358.46	91.9	3,047,358.46
Montana			1,022,902.46	39.6	2,230,177.00	100.0	3,253,079.46
Nebraska			391,022.59	14.8	2,256,040.80	100.0	2,647,063.39
Nevada			166,109.60	10.4	1,392,753.40	100.0	1,558,863.00
New Hampshire			18,435.24	3.0	529,375.00	100.0	547,810.24
New Jersey			141,119.53	9.0	1,463,483.60	100.0	1,604,603.13
New Mexico					1,260,679.38	72.8	1,260,679.38
New York					4,436,572.98	83.0	4,436,572.98
North Carolina			1,303,345.40	45.6	2,550,007.00	100.0	3,853,352.40
North Dakota			326,789.02	16.3	1,710,936.60	100.0	2,037,725.62
Ohio			115,179.11	2.5	3,971,690.40	100.0	4,086,869.51
Oklahoma					2,328,366.59	91.2	2,328,366.59
Oregon			133,104.08	6.7	1,763,280.60	100.0	1,896,384.68
Pennsylvania			456,330.66	8.3	4,640,667.40	100.0	5,096,998.06
Rhode Island					329,207.16	62.2	329,207.16
South Carolina					1,375,312.87	93.6	1,375,312.87

¹ Includes \$326,864.96 reapportioned from 1928 funds.

Unobligated balance of Federal-aid funds available for new projects as of January 31, 1932—Continued

State	1931 apportionment		1932 apportionment		1933 apportionment		Total unobligated balance
	Balance unobligated	Per cent	Balance unobligated	Per cent	Balance unobligated	Per cent	
South Dakota					\$1,267,439.45	71.8	\$1,267,439.45
Tennessee			\$1,581,683.12	58.9	2,302,183.60	100.0	3,883,841.72
Texas			17,050.18	.2	6,770,221.00	100.0	6,787,271.18
Utah			71,162.57	5.0	1,223,560.80	100.0	1,294,723.37
Vermont			42,702.12	7.0	529,375.00	100.0	572,077.12
Virginia			98,106.12	4.1	1,992,380.60	100.0	2,090,486.72
Washington			98,412.59	5.1	1,681,216.40	100.0	1,779,628.99
West Virginia			58,759.59	4.4	1,162,217.20	100.0	1,220,976.79
Wisconsin			41,182.81	1.3	2,640,713.00	100.0	2,681,895.81
Wyoming					785,801.14	57.8	785,801.14
Hawaii ¹			608,696.60	99.9	529,375.00	100.0	2,018,071.60
Total	\$1,831,431.65	1.5	13,911,924.98	11.4	90,221,174.44	86.2	108,944,531.07

¹ The total for Hawaii includes \$880,000 which was set aside as a special fund by the act of Feb. 23, 1931.

There is a balance to the credit of Mississippi from the apportionment of 1931 of \$1,266,550.71. Only two other States in the Union have not used their 1931 apportionment. These States are Florida and Alabama. There is to the credit of Mississippi for 1932, \$2,209,509. There will be apportioned in 1933, \$1,907,440.80. Thus the total unobligated balance to the credit of Mississippi is \$5,383,500.51.

The danger is that Mississippi and other States will lose Federal-aid road funds because of the inability of the States to match these funds. Under the Federal highway act all Federal-aid funds unallocated and unobligated for two years after the close of the fiscal year in which the apportionments are made lapse and are reapportioned among all of the States. For instance, a part of the Federal-aid apportion-

ment for the State of Montana for the fiscal year 1923 lapsed and that State lost \$655,546.34. For the fiscal year 1928, \$326,846.96 apportioned to Hawaii lapsed.

The apportionment of \$1,266,550.71 for the fiscal year 1931 to Mississippi will lapse if the amount is not obligated and matched by State funds before July 1, 1933. This State and other States are in danger of losing their apportionment of Federal-aid highway funds. The apportionments for the fiscal year, I repeat, lapse after two years, unless they are matched and obligated. Hence the emergency and importance of the pending bill.

I also insert the following table showing the unobligated apportionments accruing to the several States in another form, to wit:

United States Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Public Roads, current status of Federal-aid road construction as of January 31, 1932

State	Completed mileage	Under construction					Approved for construction					Balance of Federal-aid funds avail- able for new projects	
		Estimated total cost	Federal aid allotted	Mileage			Estimated total cost	Federal aid allotted	Mileage				
				Initial	Stage ¹	Total			Initial	Stage ¹	Total		
Alabama	2,405.4	\$1,541,469.27	\$748,833.58	62.6		62.6							\$5,389,119.31
Arizona	1,113.5	3,100,414.28	2,038,617.71	151.7	84.6	236.3	\$214,260.26	\$161,316.54	18.7		18.7		1,491,162.53
Arkansas	1,919.7	3,795,361.89	1,772,437.69	86.0	72.7	158.7	362,032.53	181,016.26	17.3		17.3		1,991,752.01
California	2,214.2	10,488,440.29	4,635,262.51	222.0	44.8	266.8	2,245,227.41	1,086,831.59	47.1	14.1	61.2		1,804,409.95
Colorado	1,516.8	5,212,372.26	2,662,850.29	221.9	66.0	287.9	547,326.44	269,751.14	16.3		16.3		2,067,570.63
Connecticut	288.5	3,084,244.77	1,151,757.90	22.9		22.9							713,252.11
Delaware	361.6	154,414.00	77,207.00	4.3		4.3	465,212.50	232,606.25	25.6		25.6		338,081.63
Florida	581.7	5,239,072.77	2,432,196.81	147.0		147.0	49,001.56	24,502.28	.1		.1		3,021,969.03
Georgia	2,999.0	6,988,646.29	3,250,027.65	184.6	153.5	338.1	988,337.56	494,168.76	38.0	17.2	55.2		1,744,179.93
Idaho	1,483.3	1,726,513.35	998,918.80	85.9	80.3	166.2	252,882.85	152,007.29	18.0		18.0		1,423,480.51
Illinois	2,627.1	22,713,061.29	10,563,419.39	665.8	28.7	694.5	3,796,850.76	1,642,351.35	140.2	9.0	149.2		2,905,293.87
Indiana	1,787.9	7,155,748.04	3,539,673.88	189.2		189.2	3,897,200.83	1,789,777.42	141.4	2.9	144.3		1,584,606.30
Iowa	3,379.0	331,333.50	138,397.76		11.9	11.9	1,743,306.44	826,698.01	61.3	18.0	79.3		1,973,117.19
Kansas	3,649.7	3,005,615.48	1,391,823.86	161.2	15.3	176.5	2,923,759.57	1,427,002.36	188.8	5.4	194.2		1,760,691.19
Kentucky	1,871.7	2,348,515.36	1,067,373.05	137.2	4.0	141.2	577,471.72	269,284.62	13.3	41.6	54.9		1,727,826.73
Louisiana	1,541.7	7,216,064.49	2,803,063.96	112.6	10.6	123.2	1,295,507.93	68,270.07	.5		.5		1,666,879.52
Maine	706.0	1,804,346.15	789,080.76	31.4		31.4	37,516.34	14,085.00	.9		.9		1,318,071.43
Maryland	770.1	441,451.15	149,608.89	13.4		13.4	250,874.75	125,437.37	11.8		11.8		785,651.09
Massachusetts	803.2	7,747,403.42	2,940,352.76	70.1		70.1	784,690.49	348,347.37	8.6	.2	8.8		687,103.02
Michigan	1,974.3	10,437,694.69	4,523,057.69	374.3	58.2	432.5	800,781.24	378,823.37	34.0	8.5	42.5		3,168,443.32
Minnesota	4,291.3	2,464,947.82	876,785.45	41.1	58.7	99.8	7,747,946.74	2,474,955.76	157.5	201.9	359.4		150,028.10
Mississippi	1,792.4	4,014,998.22	1,968,703.64	169.4	78.0	247.4	103,524.13	51,732.05	9.5		9.5		\$5,383,500.51
Missouri	2,951.2	2,333,230.66	975,887.91	62.8	3.4	66.2	1,560,466.24	703,143.85	60.1	3.5	63.6		3,047,358.46
Montana	2,613.9	5,417,980.89	3,034,629.24	442.7	22.8	465.5	403,394.86	224,368.61	61.4	.5	61.9		3,253,079.45
Nebraska	4,152.9	4,920,915.22	2,408,758.29	206.5	76.6	283.1	84,279.53	41,975.64	2.1		2.1		2,647,063.39
Nevada	1,345.8	974,327.23	744,741.76	30.4	89.8	120.2							1,588,863.00
New Hampshire	417.6	676,512.12	265,632.44	13.4	2.5	15.9							547,810.24
New Jersey	582.1	5,708,263.52	1,976,522.53	59.5	.6	60.1							1,604,603.13
New Mexico	2,177.7	2,748,137.56	1,788,348.90	135.7	13.8	149.5	481,693.71	303,423.51	14.2	10.4	24.6		1,260,679.33
New York	3,239.0	12,643,900.00	5,610,500.06	282.2		282.2	3,514,800.00	1,350,000.00	68.7		68.7		4,436,572.93
North Carolina	2,221.6	1,348,388.13	653,221.40	59.9		59.9	245,906.23	122,953.10	17.4	4.0	21.4		3,858,352.40
North Dakota	5,118.2	1,828,691.83	918,953.57	160.4	171.9	332.3	1,327,226.48	679,129.03	149.7	259.5	409.2		2,097,725.62
Ohio	2,820.6	7,002,996.22	2,423,620.10	100.1	29.8	129.9	1,173,200.00	572,962.46	10.7	.4	11.1		4,086,809.51
Oklahoma	2,194.1	5,179,750.02	2,522,789.07	137.4	83.4	220.8	498,297.51	217,779.48	10.8		10.8		2,328,366.59
Oregon	1,545.6	3,287,004.12	1,835,226.98	84.0	35.7	119.7	454,179.00	237,632.02	12.8	11.1	23.9		1,896,364.68
Pennsylvania	3,012.1	4,193,848.20	1,917,622.88	45.8		45.8							5,096,993.05
Rhode Island	257.5	811,653.61	427,281.05	16.6		16.6	81,305.62	40,652.81	2.2		2.2		329,207.16
South Carolina	1,997.0	2,679,138.08	1,148,707.78	63.0	43.6	106.6							1,375,312.87
South Dakota	4,035.8	2,935,366.20	1,625,070.82	174.8	175.3	350.1	497,616.45	300,502.55	54.3		54.3		1,267,439.45
Tennessee	1,662.4	848,984.19	422,357.41	24.2	8.7	32.9	437,058.09	202,974.45	13.6	6.4	20.0		3,883,841.72
Texas	7,590.0	13,052,766.47	5,861,194.84	653.6	163.0	816.6	2,728,062.52	1,234,664.59	197.3	46.8	244.1		6,787,271.18
Utah	1,218.6	650,176.96	452,772.23	59.5	.4	59.9	867,710.43	272,080.68	23.1	3.3	26.4		1,294,723.37
Vermont	339.1	104,832.58	52,345.06	4.3		4.3							572,077.12
Virginia	1,851.3	2,748,074.56	1,320,166.66	144.2	16.3	160.5	160,977.42	80,488.71	5.4		5.4		2,090,483.72
Washington	1,195.4	1,927,757.38	947,168.56	56.9		56.9	550,682.40	222,000.00	27.5		27.5		1,779,623.99
West Virginia	884.0	1,735,061.39	761,625.34	44.6	10.5	55.1	187,635.92	86,032.31	.7		.7		1,220,976.79
Wisconsin	2,668.4	3,119,586.51	1,155,563.12	138.5	14.3	152.8	90,647.32	45,000.00		3.5	3.5		2,681,895.81
Wyoming	2,022.1	2,522,816.68	1,492,230.45	173.6	88.9	262.5	384,014.48	246,608.78		47.4	47.4		785,801.14
Hawaii	63.1	974,113.04	445,557.39	30.0		30.0	82,324.99	22,869.00	1.5		1.5		2,018,071.60
Total	100,262.6	203,386,392.15	93,715,561.81	6,559.2	1,818.6	8,377.8	44,401,309.30	19,226,256.49	1,682.4	715.6	2,398.0		106,844,531.07

¹ The term "stage construction" refers to additional work done on projects previously improved with Federal aid. In general, such additional work consists of the construction of a surface of higher type than was provided in the initial improvement.

Under the emergency act of December, 1930, there was apportioned to the State of Mississippi \$1,452,736. The amount was used for 41 projects and for 201.5 miles.

Under the leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith a table showing the amount that each State will receive under the authorization of \$120,000,000 in the pending bill, to wit:

Amount each State would receive of an apportionment of \$120,000,000, using the percentages of the regular 1933 apportionment

Alabama.....	\$2,550,053
Arizona.....	1,762,636
Arkansas.....	2,091,431
California.....	4,669,711
Colorado.....	2,255,281
Connecticut.....	779,324
Delaware.....	600,000
Florida.....	1,629,204
Georgia.....	3,120,191
Idaho.....	1,508,485
Illinois.....	5,077,245
Indiana.....	3,060,266
Iowa.....	3,173,493
Kansas.....	3,276,334
Kentucky.....	2,259,648
Louisiana.....	1,740,196
Maine.....	1,070,600
Maryland.....	1,015,296
Massachusetts.....	1,712,774
Michigan.....	3,783,179
Minnesota.....	3,373,560
Mississippi.....	2,160,628
Missouri.....	3,761,014
Montana.....	2,525,108
Nebraska.....	2,557,683
Nevada.....	1,578,025
New Hampshire.....	600,000
New Jersey.....	1,659,121
New Mexico.....	1,962,340
New York.....	6,057,965
North Carolina.....	2,890,203
North Dakota.....	1,940,325
Ohio.....	4,501,069
Oklahoma.....	2,893,101
Oregon.....	1,996,128
Pennsylvania.....	5,261,052
Rhode Island.....	600,000
South Carolina.....	1,666,492
Tennessee.....	2,609,757
South Dakota.....	2,002,076
Texas.....	7,668,024
Utah.....	1,387,190
Vermont.....	600,000
Virginia.....	2,258,196
Washington.....	1,905,627
West Virginia.....	1,316,720
Wisconsin.....	2,992,438
Wyoming.....	1,540,811
Hawaii.....	600,000
	120,000,000

It will thus be seen that Mississippi will receive \$2,160,628. This amount will be immediately available and can be used to match Federal aid. Approximately \$4,500,000, without State funds, will be immediately available for highway construction in Mississippi.

If the Mississippi Highway Commission is able to obtain in the next 12 months, either through legislative enactment or from funds accruing to it, approximately \$3,500,000, there will be available for highway construction about \$11,000,000.

The great benefit of the emergency highway legislation becomes apparent. The situation that obtains in Mississippi prevails in many States.

No burdens of taxation are placed upon the States by the passage of the pending bill. The emergency act of 1930 provided for deductions from future Federal-aid apportionments in repayments over a period of five years. A similar provision obtains in the present bill for deductions for 10 years beginning in 1938.

SETTLED POLICY

While this is not the occasion for the discussion of the merits of Federal-aid highway construction a few observations are in order. Those who use the highways should pay for them. Highways are now used by citizens of all the States. Federal aid is the best plan devised for all to contribute to their costs. Federal aid to highway construction

has become the accepted policy of the country. President Hoover, in his message to Congress in December, 1929, said:

Federal aid in the construction of the highway systems in conjunction with the States has proved to be beneficial and stimulating.

The United States Chamber of Commerce is nothing if not conservative. Silas H. Strawn, president, in a communication to the chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on January 1, 1932, submitted resolutions adopted at the annual meeting in 1929, from which I quote:

The constant expansion of motor transportation has brought with it new demands for highway construction and improvement despite the great progress made during the past decade.

And again:

Increased Federal funds for use on the interstate system will at once expedite completion of this work and will release State and local funds for use on secondary roads.

Those who oppose Federal aid for highway construction maintain that the larger and wealthier States contribute more as taxes than they receive under Federal highway legislation. It is said that Mississippi, under the pending emergency act, will receive 1.8 per cent of the apportionment and will contribute only .06 of the total revenue collections. It is pointed out that Mississippi will receive under this emergency appropriation \$2,160,628, and that the total internal-revenue receipts from Mississippi for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, are \$1,584,433.15. I submit, however, that such opposition is not well founded. The large commercial institutions are domiciled in New York and other great cities, but they engage in business in all the States. The industrial centers, other States, and cities participate in the benefits of highway construction in Mississippi. In concrete roads, about 15 per cent is paid to men employed on the job. 12 per cent goes to men employed in the quarries, gravel pits, sand pits, mills and factories, and 14 per cent to men employed in transportation. Some of the costs of construction goes to miners. Fuel to produce power is necessary. Part of the cost is paid to men who build the machinery, and some goes to the cement plants and steel mills, where road materials are produced. Many city workers are employed. This is particularly true in the transportation and in the mills and the factories.

Again, States like New York receive credit for revenue collections from many railway, insurance, both fire and life, and other financial institutions that are engaged in business in all the other States of the Union. The citizens of other States contribute to the income that is paid in New York. These States are entitled to share in the distribution of the taxes from that income.

Automobiles are manufactured in Detroit. They are sold in every State in the Union. The highways of the Nation are used by the people of the country and all should contribute to their construction.

Federal aid for highway construction is fair and just. The general public receives the benefits of Federal-aid road expenditures.

In conclusion, I urge the passage of the pending bill as an emergency and as a tried and proven measure in aid of unemployment. I suggest that no further limitations or rules and regulations controlling the expenditure of the funds in Washington be inserted in the bill, by amendment. It is difficult, if not impossible, to embody in a national statute all the details that apply to labor and other conditions in all the States. The committee gave careful consideration to the legislation and it is believed that the provisions of the bill with respect to local labor will be generally applicable.

I ask those who oppose to reconsider. I call upon both Republicans and Democrats alike to vote for the passage of this bill and thus make the first and only material contribution thus far during the session to the relief of unemployment in every State in the Union. If highway construction aided unemployment in December, 1930, it will certainly doubly aid it in February, 1932. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. FULLER].

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, this measure will not give all the relief needed or desired, but it is the only bill reported to this House seeking direct relief for the unemployed. We have granted relief to the larger industries through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation bill, whereby banks, railroads, insurance companies, agricultural-credit corporations, farmers for crop purposes, and others may borrow money. A moratorium has been passed granting relief to European nations for the payment of their indebtedness due this year to the extent of \$252,000,000, and this burden must be passed on to the taxpayers of this Nation. One hundred and twenty-five million dollars has been appropriated for the relief of Federal land banks. We have also passed the Glass-Steagall bill liberalizing the Federal reserve bank system, which will go far in putting more money into circulation, but none of these measures go directly to the relief of the unemployed. Under the terms of this bill \$132,500,000 is appropriated for the purpose of matching Federal aid, and without this appropriation at least one-third of the States of the Union will be unable to carry on their Federal road-building program. Alabama, Mississippi, Tennessee, South Carolina, Florida, and Arkansas are unable to match Federal-aid money, and many other States, on account of the bond situation and the depleted income from revenue, will be unable to obtain their full benefit of Federal aid. Many States, including Rhode Island, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Ohio, North Carolina, and New York, have completed, or about completed, their 7 per cent Federal road program, but under section 4 of this measure they can add another per cent and reap the benefits under this bill.

By this money being used to match Federal aid, which is now available to all States, it will mean \$265,000,000 going direct for Federal road work, and it is estimated by the Bureau of Public Roads that this measure will be the means of at least \$300,000,000 being used on public roads in the next year. The Director of Public Roads, Mr. MacDonald, after a very extensive check and investigation declares that in the breakdown of a dollar used in building public roads that over 85 to 90 per cent goes to personnel and labor. In arriving at these figures he takes into consideration the men employed directly upon the project, the labor used in transportation and the manufacture of material and the tools used in the burning of cement, and the office force. It will thus furnish labor for at least 275,000 every day for a year and 1,000,000 for the peak load during the summer months. This will mean that 85 or 90 per cent of this \$300,000,000 will go to labor and that the Federal road program will continue in operation, which will not be possible in at least one-third of the States of this Union, if not more, unless this or a similar measure is passed.

Regardless of the actual amount that will go to labor, we do know of our own knowledge that a great percentage of it will be thus used; in addition thereto we know that this means to put \$300,000,000 into circulation, and the greater portion of this amount going into the hands of those who are in dire need and who are now out of employment.

Certainly labor is entitled to this measure in view of the fact we have appropriated fifteen times the amount of this bill for the relief of banks and their associates, to say nothing of the fact that this will mean the continuation without interruption of our Federal road program, and will leave valuable improvements in every State in the Union.

In most of the States the law provides that contracts must be let to the lowest bidder, and heretofore the Federal Road Bureau has had very little to say in this regard. The contractor is generally equipped with the most modern machinery, together with a force of men, and takes his outfits, including laborers, from one community to another and from one State to another, and local labor has not been receiving the benefit that it should.

Then, too, the contractors are apt to take advantage of the unemployment condition and pay very little for common labor. Section 3 of the bill was inserted for the purpose of

giving the bureau the right to make rules and regulations for carrying out the provisions of the act with a view of providing the maximum employment of local labor consistent with reasonable economy of construction. This will permit the director to present a questionnaire to each bidder requiring him to show how he intends to perform the contract if successful, and what wages he expects to pay. It was the desire of the committee, concurred in by Mr. MacDonald, that a reasonable wage should be paid for labor and that no contract should be awarded where there was not a minimum wage specified. It was also the desire that machinery should be eliminated as far as possible, in order to furnish more labor, consistent with reasonable economy of construction. In many instances more labor can be used consistent with reasonable economy in the building of culverts and excavations for the same by using teams and scrapers rather than highly improved machinery. This section also provides for local labor. We feel confident that under the authority given in section 3 that the Bureau of Public Roads will have a right to sit in and have a voice in saying to whom and under what circumstances contracts shall be awarded, and that the director will go the limit, consistent with reasonable economy, in providing that a living wage shall be paid and that as much local labor will be used as possible, and that labor will be given the first consideration in this program.

This measure will grant relief where relief is most needed. In my opinion, on account of the depression and the decreased income from gasoline and automobiles taxes, at least one-half of the States will not be able to carry on in their Federal road program without the relief of this or a similar bill. For instance, in my State, Arkansas, on account of this very fact we will have no money to match Federal aid, and will, therefore, be unable to carry on the Federal road program in the State this year without the relief sought in this measure.

Under this bill Arkansas will receive \$2,091,143 to match Federal aid, which will mean that we will do at least \$4,000,000 worth of road work in the State this year. We are assured that every State has a set-up and is ready to take advantage of the terms and provisions of this bill and start work at once.

Personally, I would much prefer that this money be used in the building and improving of rural post roads and farm-to-market roads not now in the Federal system, but I realize that it would take new legislation and much time would elapse before the money would be available due to new regulations and new set-ups. Then, too, it appears to be the policy of the Government to do nothing for this class of roads until the present plan under which we are working is completed. The enactment of this law will speedily hasten the day when the present program will be completed in order that we may grant relief where it is contemplated under the Constitution that the relief should go, and that is to the rural post roads.

This measure is in no sense a dole, as the money advanced will be repaid by the States out of future Federal-aid allotments in 10 equal payments, beginning in 1938. It is along the line of the La Follette-Costigan measure, differing in amount and providing for repayment.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SIMMONS].

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to review a bit of recent history in the House for just a few minutes. When the first deficiency bill came before the House, this body, under the leadership of the Democratic-controlled Committee on Appropriations, with great cheering and boasting to the country of economy, took \$10,000,000 from the appropriation for Federal aid for public roads. Then a few weeks later, when the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill was before the House, the Democratic majority on that committee, with the approval of this House, took \$9,000,000 more from the appropriation for Federal aid for public roads, again boasting to the country to look at a Democratic majority in the Congress to see how much money they were saving. In two bills \$19,000,000 was stricken from the appropriations for Federal aid to roads by the Democratic majority in this House at this session. When I was pointing out

that that saving was not real but a paper saving and not in good faith, the newspapers carried a statement signed by the Speaker of this House [Mr. GARNER], by the majority leader [Mr. RAINEY], by the minority leader [Mr. SNELL] to the effect that under their leadership this Congress would not report nor pass bills that called for an increased expenditure of money.

Of course, this was done, quite obviously, with the idea of heading off any sentiment that I might have been able to develop in favor of giving to the appropriations for public roads the amount that the Budget and the President had asked for. That publicity-getting statement served its purpose and has long since been quite obviously forgotten by the Democratic leaders.

Nineteen million dollars has been taken out of this fund this year by the Democratic majority of this House. Then the Interior Department appropriation bill came along, and that committee also wanted to boast to the country that it was saving money, and so, among other things, they took \$1,000,000 out of the Budget estimate for roads to be built in the national parks. This proposed bill calls for \$1,500,000 for national-park roads. They took out \$1,000,000—now they put back in \$1,500,000. They have gone both ways on that proposal.

This is \$20,000,000 that the Committee on Appropriations has taken out of the appropriations for roads that have been asked by the President in the Budget. Having cut out \$20,000,000 from the road appropriations and claimed the savings to the public, it is now proposed to appropriate \$130,000,000 for exactly the same purposes that the \$20,000,000 would have been used for.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMMONS. Please wait until I am through and then I shall be pleased to yield.

Then in the Interior Department appropriation bill, also in the name of economy and saving money, the appropriation bill took \$2,000,000 from the construction fund for Boulder Dam, a labor-giving project. They took \$1,164,000 from two reclamation projects that are almost entirely labor items.

Then in the bill that is now before the House the Committee on Appropriations again in the Treasury and Post Office bill has a bill before the Congress taking \$12,000,000 from the Budget estimate for money for the building of public buildings. Another item that gives employment.

So that we have here \$20,000,000 that has been cut out of the appropriations for roads this year in the name of economy for which the Democratic Party of the House is asking credit, and now it proposes to appropriate \$130,000,000 to cover up that \$20,000,000.

Then they have taken out of these other bills a total of some \$16,000,000 additional that would have gone directly to the employment of labor throughout the country. This bill is offered as a labor-giving measure. Where is the consistency in such a program? Thirty-six million dollars taken out and a proposed \$132,500,000 put in.

We have meeting this afternoon a special committee set up in the House with the idea of finding ways and means to cut Government expenditures, and the Ways and Means Committee of the House is now in session trying to devise ways of raising revenue to meet the expenses of the Government. So that at this minute one Democratic committee is trying to save money, one Democratic committee trying to spend money, and one Democratic committee trying to raise money.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two more minutes.

Mr. SIMMONS. So that we have a situation where the Democratic Committee on Appropriations of the House is cutting appropriations for the building of roads and for public improvements that employ labor, and then we have a special committee of the House set up aiming to find some way to save money, and the Ways and Means Committee is sitting up nights in an effort to balance the Budget; and then another branch of the same party comes in with a bill

asking us to appropriate \$132,500,000 to give employment to the men who have been denied employment in the appropriation bills that this House has already passed.

It just occurs to me, in all kindness, that the statement that was made by a distinguished speaker in Ohio the other night that the Democratic leadership of this House is getting a bit "dizzy" is being pretty well proven by what is going on here to-day.

I now yield to my colleague from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN. The gentleman stated that on the public-road highway item of the agricultural bill which we recently passed there is \$19,000,000 that the President requested, which we cut out, that would give employment to a number of people. The gentleman is mistaken. The Budget cut off the \$10,000,000 under the emergency act of last year.

Mr. SIMMONS. No; the gentleman misunderstood me. In the deficiency bill \$10,000,000 was taken from the Budget estimate for public roads. The President asked for \$60,000,000 and the gentleman's committee gave \$50,000,000. Then in the agricultural bill the President asked for \$109,000,000 and the committee gave \$100,000,000.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, my colleague from Nebraska made some statements that the facts do not bear out. It is true that the appropriation was cut \$10,000,000 below the President's estimate for public-road construction in the deficiency bill, and it is true that the agricultural subcommittee cut \$9,000,000 from the President's estimate for public roads. But the gentleman from Nebraska knows that in the hearings before those committees, Mr. MacDonald, Chief of the Highway Department, said that such reduction would not hurt the public-roads construction program one iota; that the amount carried in such bills would be sufficient to carry through the fiscal year until Congress met next December, when the next agricultural bill would be passed. The bill under consideration is to make a further advance to the States, which they do not have to match in the year in which it is expended. It is to be loaned to the States and repaid by the States by deducting one-tenth of the amount loaned to each State from the allotment made by the Federal Government to such State for each year from 1938 to 1948. This bill is in the interest of unemployment. The agricultural bill was passed, and the States have to match the appropriations. This appropriation does not have to be matched this year or next year, and the gentleman from Nebraska knew it when he made his speech. [Applause.]

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Utah is recognized for eight minutes.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, there have been things spoken during this debate that I am sure are confusing. We are bending every effort to get this country out of the so-called depression in which we find ourselves at the present time.

I have supported every one of the administration measures, but I do not recall that when we were considering the Reconstruction Finance Corporation measure, which I supported, nor do I recall that when we were passing the bill giving \$125,000,000 to the Federal farm-loan banks of this country, which I also supported, that these gentlemen rose with the same degree of eloquence and asked where we were going to get that money. [Applause.]

Let us be consistent. This year is not going to be worse than last. This bill only authorizes an expenditure of practically the same amount as that we spent on roads last year. We got the money last year. Is there anything on the horizon, anywhere, that indicates that we are not going to get the same amount of money that we got last year for this very laudable and fine purpose?

Oh, they may talk that we can not get the money, but let us be consistent all the way along the line.

I have faith and confidence in this country. I believe that for every just, legitimate expenditure of this Government the United States can find the necessary money. [Applause.]

Now, just a word about this bill. The gentleman from Illinois and others have said that it is outrageous. Well, let us see. It is all right to come before us and make statements of that kind, but let us look carefully into this question. This is an emergency proposition. There is about \$109,000,000 to the credit of the States, because the States can not match it. If this bill is passed, they can put the men to work with the set-up they have in 30 days.

I say to-day, without fear of successful contradiction, that there is no money appropriated for any purpose from which the labor of this country derives more benefit than it does from the appropriation for roads.

Mr. BACON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLTON. Yes.

Mr. BACON. I agree with the gentleman; but if this is an emergency relief measure, why should it not be allocated in proportion to population?

Mr. COLTON. Well, that question has been raised by the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Michigan, but this is not the only employment relief measure that will come up. If you made population the basis of apportionment, you would rearrange the entire roads appropriation scheme. For this emergency proposition you would go back to the beginning, and say that the basis on which we divided the road appropriations has not been correct. I am not prepared to do that, nor do I think it is necessary in this matter. Moreover, go into any city to-day, and you will find that the road-building associations of the country are making requisitions for labor from the cities.

It has been said, and I think without successful contradiction, that between 80 and 90 per cent of this money goes to labor. It is true that is not wholly upon the projects themselves. In round numbers let us say that there are employed upon the road-building project 300,000 men. A conservative estimate, not guesswork, based on actual investigation and survey, discloses that for every man actually employed upon the project there are two men employed in the furnishing of the material and in the transporting of it to the roads. So that for every man employed on the project you have two other men employed. This will not take up all of the slack of unemployment. I repeat again, however, it is the first and the best appropriation that has been or will be made to relieve the unemployment situation, and further, it is necessary. Out in the West, for instance, we have Indians to-day that are practically starving. If you make this appropriation, those Indians may be put to work on the roads of the reservations—and they are good road builders, too. There is a provision in the bill that will authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to prescribe rules and regulations to request and require the greatest possible amount of local labor consistent with economy to be employed.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLTON. And machinery will not be employed to the exclusion of labor, but the money is going to labor. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Do I understand the gentleman to say that that means the utilization of local common labor?

Mr. COLTON. Largely.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Does the gentleman not think that common labor ought to be specified?

Mr. COLTON. Some local skilled labor ought to be used. We do not want to limit it to any one class. We want to give to the Secretary of Agriculture the authority which in many cases he has already used, without it, to see to it that local labor is used in the building of these highways.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. That might be skilled labor. What I refer to is common labor.

Mr. COLTON. I think the Secretary of Agriculture and the road commissions may be trusted to employ to the best advantage all local labor. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

Mr. WARREN. I yield now to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTWRIGHT].

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Roads, I desire to state that the pending measure to appropriate \$132,000,000 as an emergency fund to aid in relieving the unemployment situation in America by building public roads is not ill-advised or a hastily prepared measure, as the opposition charges. Days of hearings were held on this bill by the committee before it was brought here for consideration. It was shown that the passage of this emergency legislation would put at least 1,000,000 unemployed American citizens to work. Not a dole, mind you, but it would permit a million jobless men to earn an honest livelihood. I have long contended, and still feel, that a chance to earn an honest living is all the average American citizen desires. Let me say that if ever there was a time when legislation were needed to relieve unemployment it is now. We are sure that 90 per cent of the money proposed to be appropriated for this emergency will go to pay for labor. This is the first of the many bills presented or passed by the present Congress to actually bring relief to the unemployed.

There has never been a time when this Government could get more value—more lasting value—for the money invested than is proposed in the pending bill to construct public roads through the entire country. Never has there been a time when we needed good roads in my State, and I assume in other States, more than now. Never was the public holding its breath, so to speak, wondering if Congress will really do anything to relieve the terrible conditions as now. Mr. Chairman, this bill, if and when passed, will send approximately two and a quarter million dollars to Oklahoma from the Federal Treasury in addition to the regular annual appropriation for highway construction.

Several very distinguished gentlemen, including the able gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM], and other Republican leaders, have bitterly opposed this bill on the plea of economy. Just how gentlemen could support the moratorium on foreign war debts, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation that was admitted to be a dole to the big banks to the tune of billions of dollars, both of which I am glad to say I opposed, and at the same time so bitterly oppose the pending bill that would really aid the destitute and the unemployed of the country is beyond my understanding.

We have done enough for big business—now let us do something worth while for the rest of the country. Let us pass this emergency road-building program now.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Chairman, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PARSONS].

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Chairman, this is the only measure that has been brought into this House that promises to give any employment to labor since this Congress met, December 7, 1931. Let us see where we stand in this matter. Last year we expended in the country a little more than \$1,000,000,000 on roads. That \$1,000,000,000 expenditure employed about 3,000,000 men, directly and indirectly. For the year 1932 the reductions in the cost of road construction will be about 30 per cent, so that there will be at least 900,000 less men employed in the manufacture of road material and in road building than there were in 1931. This measure will in some respect give employment to the extent of an expenditure of \$120,000,000. I have been amused at gentlemen from the large cities who oppose this measure. When we had the bill under consideration to vote \$1,750,000 for the world fair at Chicago in my State, which I was proud to support, one of the gentlemen who spoke in opposition to this bill this morning loudly acclaimed the fact that we should have that money for the world fair. The gentlemen from the cities who are opposing this measure should understand, of course, that if roads are not built throughout the country, if roads are not built from city to city, out through the country, the streets and the roads surrounding the city would be of very little value to them. The

gentlemen from the cities who are opposing this measure should at least give some consideration to the fact that you must get somewhere on your roads leading away from your city streets. I have been amused also at the attitude of some of the gentlemen across the aisle this morning in trying to inject this bill into politics. When the \$125,000,000 Federal land bank bill was under consideration we did not hear any cry of economy. That was for the bondholders to the extent of \$100,000,000, and the \$25,000,000 additional appropriation has not up to the present moment released a single farmer whose mortgage was being foreclosed. When we had the Reconstruction Finance Corporation bill under consideration I did not hear any economy talk on the floor of the House. It was said the money could be raised overnight. Up until the other day, while this organization has been functioning for 30 days, only \$24,000,000 had been loaned. At that rate it will take seven years to loan the \$2,000,000,000 you voted here.

I understand there is in the committee another bill of \$150,000,000 for home-loan banks and \$150,000,000 for insolvent banks, and yet I presume when gentlemen bring those bills on the floor of the House the idea of economy will not be raised. Let us vote for a bill that will give some relief to the country at large; that will put some people to work and help restore prosperity which the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle have talked so long about. [Applause.]

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Roads Committee I listened attentively to all of the testimony submitted to it, and at the end of that testimony I was sorry that I did not have an opportunity to vote a greater amount than the amount reported to this House in this bill. [Applause.] I also want to say as a Member whose district is principally urban that I hope before this Congress adjourns there will be some bill brought here to relieve unemployment in the cities. [Applause.] I wish to urge upon you, especially with reference to this road bill, the great need that exists for continued highway construction during this economic crisis. The highway program should be increased rather than curtailed in order to furnish work for thousands of unemployed. The materials used in roadway construction are, in the ultimate analysis, more nearly 100 per cent labor product than those of any other industry. Highway construction will therefore do more, dollar for dollar, to relieve distress than any other type of project which can be undertaken immediately. The benefits derived from improved highways are universally acknowledged to be of great and lasting benefit. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion the bill under consideration is meritorious and should be enacted.

Under the existing general law the Federal Government appropriates many millions of dollars every year, which is apportioned in amounts to the various States as follows:

One-third in the ratio which the area of every State bears to the total of all the States; one-third in the ratio which the population of every State bears to the total of all the States as shown by the latest available Federal census; one-third in the ratio which the mileage of rural-delivery routes and star routes in every State bears to the total mileage of rural delivery and star routes in all the States at the close of the next preceding fiscal year.

Upon this basis the Secretary of Agriculture determines the amount of Federal aid which each State is to receive. Before this amount is available for expenditure in the several States, the State itself is required to match this amount, dollar for dollar. It is further provided by the present Federal highway act that this sum of money is to be expended by the various State highway departments upon roads which are known and designated as primary or interstate highways. In determining, under our present law, the roads which are

to receive Federal aid, the Secretary of Agriculture is required to give preference to such projects as will expedite the completion of an adequate and connected system of highways, interstate in character.

In other words, under our Federal highway act all sums appropriated by the Congress are spent by the State highway departments upon roads which are designed to create a great system of interstate connecting highways, and such sums of money are to be supplemented, dollar for dollar, by the States. It is further provided that the total mileage of roads in a State upon which Federal money may be expended shall not exceed 7 per cent of the total mileage of the highways in the several States.

Conditions now existing in practically every State in the Union make it imperative that the appropriation carried in the present bill be made if this system is to be carried forward. The bill under consideration specifically provides that the sum of \$120,000,000 shall be immediately available for expenditures by the State highway departments without the necessity upon the part of the State highway departments supplementing the amount appropriated and received. While the bill provides that this \$120,000,000 is an advancement and that the amount received by an individual State shall be returned to the Government over a period of 10 years, beginning in 1938, as a matter of fact that provision of the bill, if enacted, will not be binding upon future Congresses and may be repealed at any time, and I predict that the sum will never be returned by the States.

It is necessary that these primary roads be completed and be maintained and it is necessary that this advancement be made. The advancement will help to relieve the unemployment situation that exists in every State, and will afford employment for the people in the sections where these roads will be constructed. Without this advancement many roads, now in an incompleting condition, would be seriously damaged, and it appears to me economically necessary that the advancement be made, and for these reasons I am supporting the proposed bill.

However, by supporting this bill I do not want to convey, Mr. Chairman, an impression that the duties of the Congress, in so far as the construction of highways is concerned, will have been done, because, in my opinion, the national legislation in reference to the building of highways is not sufficient and does not include all the roads that should be built and maintained by the National Government.

The present Federal highway act and the bill now under consideration are justified by clause 7 of section 8, Article I, of the Constitution, which provides:

The Congress shall have power to establish post offices and post roads.

This provision of the Constitution is unambiguous, and the Congress should, in my opinion, discharge in a more comprehensive manner the obligation of the National Government to build and maintain post roads. Under the existing law Federal appropriations can be applied only to the improvement of roads aggregating 7 per cent of the total mileage of the roads in a State. Everyone knows that in every State in the Union only a small percentage of the rural routes, post roads, traverse these Federal-aid roads, and the Congress, it seems to me, has been derelict in its duty, solemnly enjoined by the Constitution, in so far as the greater number of post roads in the various States are concerned.

On February 18, 1932, I prepared and introduced a bill, H. R. 9490, which is designed to discharge this obligation. Under the provisions of my bill, H. R. 9490, the rural routes in the various States will actually receive the benefit which it was, in my opinion, intended by this provision of the Constitution they should receive.

The bill, H. R. 9490, now pending before the Committee on Roads of the House, provides for an appropriation of \$100,000,000 per year for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1933, and June 30, 1934. It provides that this sum of money shall first be divided among the various States in the same ratio as now provided by section 21 of title 23 of the United

States Code of Laws. The amount thus allotted to the several States would be further divided and apportioned to the respective counties or other subdivisions created by the law of the several States and expended by the counties or other local agencies established by the laws of the States upon the rural routes which are not a part of the State highway system in the respective counties. In this way every rural route in the United States would receive direct benefit and this Government would in that way discharge the obligation enjoined upon it by the Constitution to the people residing upon these routes or in the territory served by the rural routes.

We hear it very often said that one of the problems confronting us to-day is to provide for the return of the urban population to the rural sections. That is true; but at the same time we can prevent the flow of the rural population into the urban centers by giving to these people some of the direct benefits of Federal expenditures, and I know of no better way to do this than to follow the plain mandate of our great Constitution.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the Committee on Roads of the House and that the leaders in this Congress may realize the importance of this matter and that this Congress may favorably act upon H. R. 9490, because the bill now under consideration does not reach the people residing away from these Federal-aid roads.

I have felt constrained to call the attention of Congress to this bill in these remarks with the hope that the aid of men older in service may be enlisted in my effort to carry these benefits to the rural communities as well as to continue our expenditures upon the great trunk roads that now are a part of the great highway system. This can not be done under the bill now before the House, and I appeal on behalf of that great body of taxpayers and citizens who can not speak for themselves that some of the highway funds appropriated yearly by Congress be expended upon these rural routes and that we in that manner insure to those people the same consideration that we give to those who may happen to live on one of these great trunk interstate highways. It may be argued that to build and improve the rural routes would be too expensive; but, may I say, Mr. Chairman, there have never been any Federal funds appropriated for these particular roads that are covered by my bill, H. R. 9490, and our great Government should not by a plea for economy fail to give to those people who reside away from the great highways the same consideration that is given to those who live elsewhere. Every dollar that is expended in developing our rural sections traversed by the now neglected rural routes will return to the Government tenfold and will contribute materially to the welfare of our people. [Applause.]

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN].

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, this is the first legislation that has been before this Congress that will take care of the man who is unable to help himself during these days of distress and want, the laboring man. Strange as it may seem, we are met with the plea that the laboring man should be denied relief. Why? Because we have to balance the Budget.

I sat upon this floor and saw Members of this body relinquish over \$250,000,000 to take care of foreigners, and yet not a word was said, when the moratorium bill was being considered, about balancing the Budget. We passed a bill that will give to the banks and railroads and insurance companies of this country \$2,000,000,000, and not a word did I hear from the opposition about balancing the Budget. They seem to think it is all right when we vote money out of the Treasury to protect property and that it is all wrong when we vote money out of the Treasury to protect human lives. [Applause.]

I, for one, want to say to the gentlemen in opposition, that the Democratic Party has always placed human rights above property rights. [Applause.] Balancing the Budget! I believe in balancing the Budget, but let me tell you that if 25,000,000 men and women in this country are to remain in poverty and distress, if that is the price it costs to balance

the Budget, then I am against balancing the Budget until we bring relief to our men and women.

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the American laboring man, I want to say that he is not asking this Congress or anybody else for charity, but he is demanding work. [Applause.] That is what he is asking for. When we try to put him to work so that he can support his wife and children, we are told that it will not do; that we have to balance the Budget. If this bill will put 1,000,000 American men to work, then for God's sake let us pass it and put them to work. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$120,000,000, to be immediately available for expenditure in emergency construction on the Federal-aid highway system, with a view to increasing employment. Such sum shall be apportioned by the Secretary of Agriculture to the several States by the method provided in section 21 of the Federal highway act, as amended and supplemented (U. S. C., title 23, chs. 1 and 2; Supp. V, title 23, chs. 1 and 2). (The sums apportioned to the States shall be available as a temporary advance of funds to meet the provisions of such act as to State funds.) The sum apportioned to any State under this section may be used to match the regular annual Federal-aid apportionments made to such State (including the one for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933), and when so used such sum shall be available for expenditure in paying the share of such State in the cost of Federal-aid projects. No sums apportioned under this act shall be advanced except for work on the Federal-aid highway system performed before June 30, 1933: *Provided*, That the sums so advanced shall be reimbursed to the Federal Government over a period of 10 years, commencing with the fiscal year 1938, by making deductions from regular apportionments made from future authorizations for carrying out the provisions of such act as amended and supplemented.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this measure will do good as far as it goes. It will afford employment for an indefinite number of men, those who are able to get jobs because of it and help them, and those who are dependent upon them. It will relieve the able-bodied, the capable, the skillful, the fortunate in job getting, and those in the prime of life—in short those groups which ordinarily would be better able to take care of themselves without it. But for the millions of children and old people, for the widows and orphans, for the cripples, and incompetents, for the classes which lead but a scrambling existence at best, and who are always the first to be submerged—for all those millions it promises not one penny of help.

Eight millions of our fellow citizens are unemployed. Probably twice that number are working less than half time, but that is but a small part of the awful cloud which hangs over this country. There are behind them—the darkest part of all the picture—the hopeless millions of their dependents, many of them now suffering for the necessities of life.

For the helpless it appears nothing is to be done. From all that appears, this measure is to exhaust the magnanimity of the Federal Government for the relief of the distress which prevails throughout the land. These piteous millions have looked toward the administration, but found that its face was turned against them. They turned then to Congress, but their pleas have fallen upon deaf ears. Now, it seems that with making this gesture and affording this small measure of relief we have the answer of the administration, and, alas! the answer, as well, of the representatives of the people, that these suffering and destitute citizens shall be sentenced to starvation.

As for me, I dissent from any such inhumane program. I protest with all earnestness and solemnity against such heartlessness toward those who are suffering for bread. [Applause.]

We have men in very high positions in our Government who are now found to stand upon the high principle that they will not accept Federal relief for the starving when it is to be administered through a Federal agency. That is, they will not accept it in this particular instance. They

accepted Federal highway aid administered by a Federal bureau; they supported the maternity act, administered by a Federal authority; they voted for farm relief, at the hands of the Federal Farm Board. In the drought relief which we voted a year ago there was provision for Federal administration. They accepted Federal aid administered by a Federal bureau, and found it agreeable, in connection with the crop-loan provision of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation act. It is only now, when it is proposed to use a few pennies of Uncle Sam's money to buy bread for the starving, that these worthy gentlemen suddenly discover for the first time the immutable principle which forbids that they accept it when administered by a Federal agency. They will not accept Federal aid through a Federal bureau to buy food for the starving, but they will take it for anything else. When starvation is involved the aid must be handed over to the States for administration by local politicians or they will not take it at all.

I protest. It is useless, perhaps, to express these sentiments; nevertheless I feel it my duty to my own people, many of whom—even of my personal acquaintances—are now actually suffering for bread; many of whom are in a state of starvation, and not too slow at that. I feel it my duty to them, 50,000 of whom are being fed by public charity—

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Over 50,000 of my constituents are now being fed by public charity, and probably 50,000 more are in dire need and ought to be receiving some help. My district is merely typical of many industrial districts.

To say that the local communities can care for the needs of their people is foolish; more than that, it is heartless and wicked. They can not do it. Every instinct of humanity, every sound principle of government demands that the Federal Government shall come to the rescue. Even if I did not represent a suffering people I would feel it my duty, having at heart the best interests of my country and the security of its institutions, to advocate some help for them in their hour of despair. [Applause.]

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KETCHAM: On page 2, line 1, strike out the period, insert a comma and the following: "except that such apportionment shall be upon the basis of population instead of area, population, and mileage."

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. KETCHAM. I desire to be heard briefly on the point of order, but should not the gentleman from North Carolina state his point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would rather hear from the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, with reference to the amendment, I can scarcely understand how the point of germaneness can be lodged against it, for the simple reason that reference to the statute itself shows very clearly the method by which the distribution is to be made. That statute is referred to specifically in the language of the first section which has just been read. That statute provides that the distribution shall be by area, by road mileage, and by population. The amendment which I have offered simply eliminates two of those factors and includes only population. It would, therefore, seem to me to be perfectly germane to the section in view of the fact that "population" is included in the language in the original bill.

Mr. MICHENER rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan desire to be heard for or against the point of order?

Mr. MICHENER. Against the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, from the statement made by the Chair when the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KETCHAM] suggested he wanted to be heard it would appear that the Chair had already made up his mind.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Michigan that when the other gentleman from Michigan first suggested that he would offer this amendment, the Chair had the parliamentary look up the precedents, and those precedents have been looked up. But if the gentleman from Michigan desires to be heard, the Chair will gladly hear him.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman from Michigan probably can not change the situation. However, the gentleman from Michigan does want to call the Chair's attention to the fact that the purpose of this bill is to authorize supplemental appropriations for emergency highway construction. The purpose of the bill is to provide emergency relief to the unemployed. The purpose of the bill is to provide relief to the greatest number of people possible. While I am familiar with some of the precedents which the Chair will probably cite, I want specifically to call the Chair's attention to the fact that this bill has but one purpose, and that purpose is emergency relief and to furnish employment. The method provided in the bill is material only as it will give the most work to the most people. The suggested amendment will distribute the money where it will best serve the announced purpose of the bill. The specific method should be considered in connection with the specific intent of the bill.

Any amendment which deals with the purpose of the bill, or any amendment which accomplishes the thing which the bill aims at, would, in the opinion of the gentleman speaking, be germane.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Is the Chair prepared to rule on the question?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BLANTON). Unless the gentleman from Alabama desires to speak against the point of order, the Chair is ready to rule.

The bill provides a specific method of distribution, to wit, that contained in the highway act. The method of distribution in the highway act is a specific method. It has been held many times that, where a bill provides a specific method, an amendment providing a different method is not germane. The Chair has before him a decision made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] directly on the point. That decision was made April 24, 1929. The Chair will quote the syllabus:

To a bill seeking to afford agricultural relief by one specified method, an amendment seeking to afford the same relief by a different method was held to be not germane.

The Chair will follow that decision and sustain the point of order.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LaGUARDIA: On page 2, line 17, strike out the period, insert a colon and the following: "Provided further, That none of the money herein authorized to be appropriated shall be paid to any State on account of any project on which convict labor shall be directly employed."

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Chairman, I will state to the gentleman that we asked the Director of Public Roads about this question—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the Chair understand that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] reserves a point of order?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Will the gentleman make the point of order, because I do not want to take up the time of the House unnecessarily?

Mr. BANKHEAD. The reservation is made upon the proposition that it is not germane to the section of the bill.

I may not press the matter, Mr. Chairman, if I may be allowed to consult with the chairman of the committee at a moment.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Chairman, I think I can explain the matter satisfactorily.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation.

Mr. FULLER. The director said that last year he never permitted any of this money to be used for convict labor, and he submitted section 3 in order that he might promulgate rules and regulations to control the expenditure of the money in the letting of these contracts. This was done at the instance of the Director of the Bureau of Roads, and the director states that under no circumstances will he allow any of this money to be used where convict labor is employed; and he told us further not to put it in the bill, but that he would attend to it under the provisions of section 3.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I think this is purely a legislative function of the highest degree, and it seems to me that every Member of this House would want to be sure that we will not only not make ourselves ridiculous before our own country but before the entire world, and when we are providing appropriations to relieve unemployment we will be assured there will be no loophole for employing convict labor.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. WARREN. I am very much in sympathy with the statement just made by the gentleman from New York, although I think there is full authority to prevent the use of convicts now. I think the gentleman, however, has offered his amendment to the wrong section, and I suggest to the gentleman that he offer the amendment to section 3, and the committee will accept the same.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I will take the gentleman's word for that, and on the assurance of the gentleman that he will accept my amendment, if offered to section 3, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment and I offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LaGUARDIA: On page 2, after line 17, strike out the period, insert a colon and the following: "And provided further, That the prevailing rate of wages as provided in the act of March 3, 1931, shall be paid to all skilled and unskilled labor employed in the construction of all roads in said Federal highway system."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It strikes me that the amendment is not germane, inasmuch as this legislation contemplates that the work shall be done under rules and regulations as provided for in section 3 and under the provisions of the Federal highway act.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from New York on the point of order.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, the amendment provides that the prevailing rate of wages shall be applied. The very purpose of this bill is to increase employment. It is an employment bill, and any amendment pertaining to the payment of such employment goes to the very crux of the bill and, of course, is germane. There can not be any other interpretation of germaneness than to fix a rate of pay in a bill calling for employment.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BLANTON). The Chair is ready to rule.

When the distinguished gentleman from New York, Mr. SNELL, was occupying the chair on December 9, 1930, he held that to a bill appropriating money for various construction projects and containing sections dealing with the interchangeability of appropriations and with the submission of reports to be made by the President, an amendment offered

as a new section providing that none of the money should be used to pay laborers working more than seven hours a day was germane.

Under the authority of this ruling the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Now, gentlemen, there is nothing extreme or radical in my amendment. It simply carries out the purpose of the bill, and that is that a fair proportion of the money goes to the men who do the work, and not to the contractor.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. May I ask the gentleman if this is substantially the language of the Bacon Act?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Yes. I can not see how there can be any objection to my amendment. This is not a bill for the promotion of profits to the contractors. If it were it might be well to vote down my amendment. We are appropriating \$120,000,000 in an emergency, and we want to spread it over as many workers as we can. This will prevent contractors paying their men, as some contractors are doing, as low as 75 cents a day.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. I might say that that is the practice all over the United States. In California, for instance, the contractors paid less than the going wage, and the labor commission was utterly powerless to prevent it.

Mr. HERR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. HERR. I want to say to the gentleman that in the State of Washington, in the reclamation projects, they have been paying as low as \$1.50 a day.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Then we better get after the contractors and put them out of business. Let us protect the workers on these roads and provide a decent American wage.

Mr. HERR. You can not do it under the law, for there is no provision by which the contractors could be reached.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Oh, yes; if my amendment is adopted, we can surely compel the payment of the prevailing rate of wages.

Mr. BEEDY. I want to say that that is what they have been doing down in Maine, and they have threatened to reduce the local wages if they did not accept their wage.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. My amendment would compel them to pay the prevailing wages.

Mr. HARE. I would like to get the gentleman's definition of the prevailing wage. Does that mean the prevailing wage of the locality, or the uniform wage of the entire country?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. The prevailing wage where the work is being performed.

Mr. FULLER. That is the definition in the act of March 1, 1931?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Yes. I make reference to the act for that very purpose.

Mr. BACON. I will say that the amendment that the gentleman from New York offers is the same language in the bill I introduced in the last Congress. I am delighted that he has offered this amendment so that it can be included in the contracts.

Mr. ARENTZ. If the gentleman will yield, I want to say that the difficulty we got into in the Boulder Dam on the wage scale was that there was no local wage scale, and we put in the nearest employment area.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. If we put in the prevailing wage scale, and they do not pay it, we will stop the payment at the Comptroller General's office. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to have the amendment again reported.

There being no objection, the Clerk again reported the amendment.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGUARDIA] will be adopted. The amendment seems to be so fair and equitable that I think the chairman of the committee ought to state that he will accept the amendment and then let us proceed with further debate upon the bill. I pause for

a moment to see whether or not the gentleman in charge of the report of the committee will state that the amendment is agreeable to the committee.

Mr. WARREN. Since having an opportunity to read the act of March 3, 1931, dealing with contractors, subcontractors, and so forth, on public works in the United States, the committee accepts the amendment of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I do this for the purpose of directing the attention of the proponent of the amendment to a condition that perhaps he is not acquainted with. If I am not in error, in Wisconsin, our State in its highway improvement provides a scale of wages higher than the prevailing rate. This amendment would negative the action of our State in prescribing a certain high rate shall be paid to all labor engaged in highway construction. It is not the purpose of the gentleman, I know, to lower the rate below that which the State prescribes. The State of Wisconsin says that all labor shall receive so much per hour, I can not say how much.

Mr. BACON. May I explain that?

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not wish to have a lower rate paid in the State of Wisconsin than the rate the State prescribes as a living wage to the men employed in this line of work. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BACON. I think I can answer that satisfactorily to the gentleman. If the prevailing wage rate in Wisconsin happens to be higher than the prevailing wage rate in Florida, the prevailing wage in Wisconsin will obtain.

Mr. STAFFORD. The prevailing wage rate is lower than the State prescribes. Our State through its legislature prescribes that a certain definite rate shall be paid to labor on highways. I do not want to have the rate lowered by this amendment.

Mr. BACON. It will not be lowered.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. The rate paid by the State establishes the prevailing rate. It is established in New York in the same way.

Mr. STAFFORD. Very well.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment by inserting, after the act of March 31, 1931, the words "Public, No. 798, Seventy-first Congress."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, we are passing through the greatest depression in the history of the Nation. No one bill can remedy the situation. We have passed several bills, others will be considered during the session. This bill authorizes supplemental appropriations for emergency highway construction.

Section 1 authorizes the appropriation of \$120,000,000 for expenditures in emergency construction on the Federal-aid highway system with a view to increasing employment. This sum is to be apportioned by the Secretary of Agriculture to the several States, as now provided by law. It is immediately available. The report of the committee is unanimous. It is approved, or at least no objection is made, by the Director of the Bureau of Roads. It must be expended by June 30, 1933.

Section 1 also authorizes any State to use its apportionment to match the annual Federal-aid apportionments made to the State, conditioned that the money be used on Federal-aid highways and that the sum so advanced shall be reimbursed to the Federal Government over a period of 10 years, commencing with the fiscal year 1938. The repayments are to be made by deductions from the regular apportionments on and after that date during a period of 10 years. The amount out of this sum authorized to be prorated to the States may be used by the several States to match other advancements by the Federal Government to be repaid in ten installments beginning in 1938.

Section 2 authorizes appropriations for national forest highways of \$5,000,000; for constructing trails, bridges, and fire lanes in national forests, \$3,000,000; for construction of roads, trails, and bridges in national parks and national monuments, \$1,500,000; for construction and improvement of roads on Indian reservations, \$1,000,000; and for construction and maintenance of main roads through unappropriated or unreserved public lands, nontaxable Indian lands, or other Federal reservations other than the forest reservations, \$2,000,000.

Section 3 authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to make rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of the act but specifically directs that these regulations shall be made with the view of providing the maximum employment of local labor consistent with reasonable economy of construction. This is an important addition in these depressed times. It should be sympathetically administered.

Section 4 provides that whenever provision has been made by any State for the completion and maintenance of 90 per cent of its system of primary or interstate and secondary or intercounty highways equal to 7 per cent of the total mileage of such State, that an additional mileage of 1 per cent may be added to the total Federal highway mileage of the State.

The purpose of the bill is twofold. Its main object now is to provide emergency employment to local labor throughout the country.

Section 3 emphasizes that the rules made by the Secretary of Agriculture shall be with a view of employment of local labor consistent with economy of construction.

I greatly fear that the appropriations heretofore made have not given the amount of employment to local labor that we had hoped. The work on Federal highways, for the most part, has been let out by contract, and the contractors have to a great extent used machinery and their regular forces of men without any very great benefit to local labor.

I am glad that this section is in the bill, and I trust that drastic rules and regulations may be made by the Secretary of Agriculture with a view of aiding the unemployment situation throughout the country.

I also indorse section 4 of the bill, which authorizes the adding of 1 per cent additional to the Federal highway system of a State where provision has been made for 90 per cent of its present system of highways. This will enable additional mileage to be added to the Federal highway system in each State. In my judgment, this mileage should be increased more than 1 per cent. It should be at least 3 per cent additional.

My State is a comparatively new one, but is making rapid strides in highway construction. We are expending large sums of money, secured for the most part from a gasoline tax and automobile licenses, on Federal highway systems. The hearings disclose that there is no unobligated balance due from Federal appropriations to Oklahoma for the year 1932. The apportionment due my State for 1933 is \$2,328,366.59. This appropriation, when made, will give our State an additional amount.

I regard expenditures on roads as good investments. Everyone, whether living in the cities or the towns throughout the country, is benefited by expenditures on roads. Expenditures of this character enhance the value of farm lands. Roads provide arteries over which farm products may be marketed.

They aid the schools and the churches. They make it possible for every child living on the farm to attend city schools and receive a high school education. Good roads eliminate distance. They bring the city and rural population together.

The expenditure of Federal-aid appropriations matched by State funds on Federal-aid highways will permit the State highway commission to lay out additional State roads upon which State and county funds may be expended. We need to have more money expended upon farm-to-market roads, connecting up every community with State and Federal highways and with the market centers. I can not emphasize this need too strongly. I wish I had more time to dwell upon it. This money expended on Federal roads

will release local and State money to build local farm-to-market roads. I would like to see every road over which rural mail is carried made a Federal-aid road.

I supported the first good roads bill, approved July 11, 1916. The appropriation then authorized was small. We have increased it from year to year, and as a result there has been a very great improvement in our national highways. We should not be content, however, until these highways extend through and connect up every section of our common country. Every county seat and every community center should be served by a State or Federal highway and these connected up with improved roads extending into and serving every community.

The amount authorized to be expended out of the Federal treasury in aid of good roads, including the amount carried in this bill, aggregates \$1,490,000,000. This does not include appropriations authorized for forest reservations, national parks and Indian reservations. These appropriations have greatly stimulated road building, brought all sections nearer together, and aided in the development of the entire country.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, while I would like very much to support this bill because of the benefits in road building which would accrue to the State of Washington and the third congressional district, I feel that I can not give my vote to the measure until I have some knowledge as to where the Federal Government is to secure revenue for its Treasury.

I regret that this bill has been brought out of committee in such haste and hurried to consideration on the floor in such record-breaking time. In my opinion, it would have been far better to have withheld the consideration of this bill until we received some word from the Committee on Ways and Means as to how it proposes to raise funds by Federal taxation.

The revenues of the Government have dropped all along the line. There has been a perpendicular drop in receipts from income taxes, both corporate and individual. This drop is from a figure of \$2,250,000,000 in 1930 to an estimated figure of \$650,000,000 in 1933; and until we can make sure we will have revenues sufficient to restore the solvency of the United States, it is not wise to authorize any new appropriations in any considerable sum. This bill calls for \$132,000,000. If the House passes it, it is fair to presume that it will be the vehicle in the other body for hanging on proposals which will call for additional millions. Once the House becomes committed to this bill for the \$132,000,000 authorization it will not be easy to stand against any additional sums that the other body may add even though the additions may run into large figures.

For these reasons and for the further important reason that while this bill is being put forth as a relief measure for unemployment, it must be apparent to anyone who will take pencil and paper in hand and figure for three minutes, that the employment relief phase is the small part of the bill. In my opinion, not 40 per cent of the whole sum would reach unemployed labor, and that 40 per cent would have to be spread among 48 States and the Territory of Hawaii. The relief in unemployment, if expected to be spread over 100 days' time, would be extremely small—too small to warrant calling this an unemployment or relief measure.

I realize that my voice and vote can be but in the nature of a protest. The nature of the bill is such that it qualifies along pork-barrel lines so that it will receive a vote far beyond that it would receive could it be considered on its merits alone.

Mr. HUDDLESTON offered the following amendment:

Page 2, at the end of the amendment offered by Mr. LaGuardia, insert a new section, to be known as section 2, to read as follows: "That the sum of \$100,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated, to be available until July 1, 1933, to the President of the United States, for the relief of persons residing in the United States who may be in need of the necessities of life. In disbursing the said sum the President shall have authority to use and employ such agencies as he may create for that purpose or as may already exist, and may cooperate with organizations, States, counties, and municipalities upon such terms and conditions as he may deem best, and may disburse same either as gifts or loans of money or of supplies to the beneficiaries."

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is clearly well taken. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma offered the following amendment:

Page 2, at the end of section 1, add: "Provided, That whenever provision has been made by any State for the establishment of a system of farm market roads under the jurisdiction of the State highway commission, such roads shall be eligible to be constructed under the provisions of this act."

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Chairman, under a former ruling by the Chair, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma is clearly not germane, and I therefore make the point of order that it is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is clearly subject to a point of order. It is not germane. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. RAMSPECK offered the following amendment:

At the end of the LaGuardia amendment, already adopted, strike out the period, insert a comma, and add the following: "Said prevailing rate of wages shall be predetermined and made a part of the specifications and contract."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order, because I could not hear the reading of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk again reported the amendment offered by Mr. RAMSPECK.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order for the reason that if we are going to depart from the established policy of the House that when an amendment is once adopted we can modify it, I will wish to offer an amendment along the line that I was speaking upon. I think the gentleman is too late in offering his amendment. I therefore make the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have had a great deal to do in my lifetime with the building of roads. I was one of the original five men in the State of Illinois who established the hard-road system in that State.

We organized in the State and we passed a \$60,000,000 bond issue for the building of cement roads in the State of Illinois. Therefore I have had a great deal to do with the building of roads and I know how much labor it takes to build these hard roads.

When we began to build cement roads in the State of Illinois a contractor would use from 75 to 100 men to build two miles of road. Finally they improved the machinery to a point where those 75 men had been reduced to 15 men. In other words, with the machinery of to-day you can build two miles of hard road with 15 men. That represents \$60,000 worth of road.

I do not object to the Government appropriating money for good roads; in fact, I am willing to vote for a bill that will give employment, but I tell you gentlemen you ought to think about this, because the bill which you have under consideration to-day will not employ any considerable amount of labor. The bill is not so drawn as to permit the hiring of men, but much of the money will go into materials and into the pockets of the contractors.

All of the States of the country to-day have rural roads, roads over which the mail carriers travel. These roads are in a deplorable condition, and you should put an amendment into this bill whereby this money will all go on these rural roads. Of course these will be gravel roads, and on such roads it will be possible to hire much help to dig the ditches and make the culverts. If you will do that you will put at work at least 75 men to each 2 miles of road, and you will do that for the same amount of money you will put at work 15 men on these general highways.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Yes.

Mr. ALLGOOD. I have an amendment to offer to that effect.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. All right. I think you are on the right track as far as putting your money into good roads is concerned; I think that is the correct thing to do, but in doing it you should not make a foolish move. You should not provide \$120,000,000 that will positively go into the pockets of the contractors and which will not help from a labor standpoint.

I know what I am talking about. I have been in this road business in the State of Illinois for over 15 years. I was sent to South America by President Coolidge to promote good roads there, so I know what I am talking about. I say to you that as surely as you men vote for this and pass it as it is you are not doing what you are intending to do. In other words, you will not employ labor, but you will simply take \$120,000,000 out of the Treasury of the United States and put it into the pockets of the contractors. Therefore I hope you will consider some amendment whereby this money will go on the rural roads, and whenever you get these rural roads built you will be in a better position to have the delivery of mail thereon.

Mr. COLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Yes.

Mr. COLTON. Under a similar appropriation last year there were nearly 300,000 men employed directly upon the projects, and a conservative estimate showed that there were two additional men, or about 600,000, employed in furnishing materials and transporting them to the projects.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. The gentleman does not mean to tell me he expects to put any man to work under this bill, does he?

Mr. COLTON. Indeed I do.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. How many men?

Mr. COLTON. We will put to work nearly 1,000,000 men on the projects and furnishing and transporting material.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. The gentleman is misinformed. It would take ten times as much money to do that.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from North Carolina that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. On page 1, line 8, beginning with the word "States," strike out all of the remaining language on that page and the first two words on page 2.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KETCHAM: On page 1, beginning in line 8, after the word "States," strike out the remainder of line 8, all of lines 9 and 10, and the word "and" and the figure "2" in parentheses, on page 2, in line 1.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHENER. If the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan prevails, will it then be in order for the gentleman from Michigan to offer the amendment which was ruled out of order a short time ago?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that that is not a proper parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will cross that bridge when he reaches it. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KETCHAM) there were—ayes 71, noes 116.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, to be immediately available, for expenditure in emergency construction on public roads (other than the Federal-aid highway system) during the period ending June 30, 1933, with a view to increasing employment, the following sums to be expended for the purposes specified:

(1) For the construction and improvement of national-forest highways, \$5,000,000.

(2) For the construction and maintenance of roads, trails, bridges, fire lanes, etc., including the same objects specified under the heading "Improvement of national forests" in the agricultural appropriation act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, approved February 23, 1931 (46 Stat. 1242), \$3,000,000.

(3) For the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of roads and trails, inclusive of necessary bridges, in the national parks and national monuments under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, \$1,500,000.

(4) For construction and improvement of Indian reservation roads under the provisions of the act approved May 26, 1928 (45 Stat. 750; U. S. C., Supp. V, title 25, sec. 318a), \$1,000,000.

(5) For the survey, construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of main roads through unappropriated or unreserved public lands, nontaxable Indian lands, or other Federal reservations other than the forest reservations, under the provisions of the act approved June 24, 1930 (46 Stat. 805; U. S. C., Supp. V, title 23, sec. 3), \$2,000,000.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 2, in line 20, after the word "roads," strike out "(other than the Federal-aid highway system)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GLOVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think I have as consistent a record for economy in the casting of my votes in this House during this session as any man in it. We have heard a great deal of cry from the other side of the House to-day with reference to the drain upon the United States Treasury. I remember very well the other day when we had a matter here for an appropriation of \$1,000,000 to Chicago the gentleman from Illinois who spoke over there this afternoon did not think then about conserving the interests of the Treasury.

When you had up your proposition here of voting for a moratorium of \$252,000,000, which ought to-day to be in the Treasury of the United States, I cast my vote against that. I saw some of you over there who are almost shedding tears to-day about giving a little relief to the unemployed cast your ballots for a \$2,000,000,000 proposition and vote \$500,000,000 out of the United States Treasury at one time.

This is the only bill, so far as I recall now, that has been brought into this House that seeks to give any relief to the unemployed in the United States. It is said we have 8,000,000 of them. I imagine we have more than that. If this bill takes care of 1,000,000 or 1,000 it is a step in the right direction, and the measure ought to prevail.

When you put money into good roads or into internal improvements in the United States you are putting it where it will be multiplied many times, and it is money that is not going to be wasted.

Gentlemen talk about the cities not getting any benefit from road improvements. Why, bless your life, many of the people who work on the public highways under these contracts live in the cities and go out in trucks in the morning and come back at night. This will relieve conditions in your cities as well as in the country generally.

Mr. YON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLOVER. Yes.

Mr. YON. Do not the contractors in a great many instances live in the cities, and they are benefited as well as the people that they employ?

Mr. GLOVER. This bill will benefit the merchant; it will benefit everybody that has anything to do with business. If you put money into the laboring man's hands he is going to spend it and put it in use. The trouble is now that it is concentrated in the hands of a few, and those that would spend it have not got it to spend. This will give them a little bit of money so they can take care of themselves and their families.

We heard a statement made by a Member on the other side to-day that he hoped this bill would meet with a presidential veto. I have more confidence in your President than you have. I believe he is a man of too much feeling for the laborers of this country to veto the first proposition that comes from this Congress to relieve the unemployed; but if

he should do it, as one Member of this House I stand here ready to join with you in passing the measure over his veto.

Mr. ALMON. I think the gentleman has misquoted the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wood]. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wood] did not say the President would veto the bill but said that he hoped the President would veto it if it were passed.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it has been said that when a man in an argument has no facts to back him up he must either make fun of the other fellow and laugh or get angry. A few minutes ago when, in answer to a question, I gave the estimate of the number of men that would be employed this year on the roads by reason of the road appropriations there were many men over here who laughed.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Roads went into this matter very carefully, and they were as credulous in the beginning as these men who laughed. I make the statement now that last year there was an average of about 288,000 men employed upon road projects in this country, and in the actual breakdown of the road dollar appropriated it was conservatively shown that for every man employed on the project there were two other men employed in the furnishing of the material and in transporting it. It is conservative to say that nearly a million men will be put to work as a result of this appropriation.

Gentlemen, it is well enough to try to make fun and laugh, but this is a serious matter. This is the first bill that has been offered in Congress for the direct relief of the unemployed. I have gone with my party leaders in every single effort they have made to support the President of the United States in this emergency, and I expect to in the future, but I say that when a serious bill of this kind comes before the committee it is not fair to meet the arguments that are presented by the committee with laughter and derision. This does not get us anywhere.

Mr. Chairman, just one more word in conclusion. I say again—and the facts have not been disputed—that there is no appropriation made by the Federal Government where so large a percentage of the dollar goes to labor as that for the highways. Your committee went into that very carefully and presented this bill, with the honest belief that it is a bill for the relief of the unemployed. [Applause.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 10, after the figures "\$1,500,000," strike out the period, insert a comma, and add the following: "including national parks authorized to be established under the act of May 22, 1926 (U. S. C., title 16, sec. 403)."

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered in the interest of the Smoky Mountain Park, which would be excluded without it. The Great Smoky Mountain National Park was created by an act of Congress in 1926. The substantive act provided for the development of this great park when 425,000 acres had been acquired. There have been 397,000 acres acquired at a cost of between \$8,000,000 and \$10,000,000. The Federal Government has expended nothing except about \$30,000 annually for the supervision of the park.

About 150,000 tourists visited the park last year and it is rapidly becoming one of our most popular national playgrounds. It is very important that some work be carried on in the way of roads and building trails. Of course, this amendment does not arbitrarily require any portion of the amount to be expended in the park. It merely brings the Great Smoky Mountain Park into the picture subject to the discretion of the Park Service.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Chairman, I would not be fair to the committee if I did not state that this amendment proposed by the gentleman from Tennessee affects only the State of Tennessee and my own State of North Carolina. It would mean, if the amendment was adopted, that it would apply to an expenditure in a section of my own State.

But that park has not been officially taken over by the Government of the United States, and therefore, until that

project has been actually taken over, and inasmuch as heretofore we have not appropriated for building of roads and trails in areas of that kind—

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I think the gentleman must be mistaken when he says that this park has not been taken over by the Federal Government. The Federal Government has been paying for superintendence for a number of years, and 397,000 acres have been conveyed to the Government. Deeds for same have been delivered and accepted.

Mr. WARREN. I will modify my statement to this extent: I think they have accepted a portion of it only, but the entire acreage has not been accepted. They have not fixed the status of it as they have other national parks, and for that reason no appropriation has been available in the past. I think the amendment ought to be voted down, and I am asking you to vote down an amendment that does affect my own State.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. There has developed here some opposition to this bill. It seems to align the cities against the rural districts. It is a question of area against population.

We have passed some relief bills in this House during the 10 weeks since the Democratic Party came into control, bills for the relief of our banks, our railroads, and agriculture, and to a degree, at least, the entire country will participate in the benefits of these measures.

I am advised that this bill comes before us with the unanimous vote of the Committee on Roads. It is purely a loan measure seeking to aid the States. We loaned our money to foreign nations; we are now loaning our money to private business; surely there must be some merit in a bill granting the same consideration to the States of the Union.

I come from a city, and the argument that the cities may give more and receive less and that the rural districts will receive more and give less does not appeal to me. If unemployment exists and human misery accompanies it in any place in America, if relief is required in Michigan or Georgia or any other State in the Union, then those people affected are Americans and entitled to my consideration and yours. Even though this may not meet with the approval of the President of the United States, the same leadership that inspired this bill should, in the interest of the men who come from the cities, bring out a building bill for the construction of public buildings, most of which would be located in the cities. The President of the United States, I believe, prevented the Federal Building Commission at the beginning of this session from sending to the Congress their regular annual authorization for the construction of public buildings, buildings vitally needed by the Government throughout the country. If this bill is passed, then we should bring out a bill for the construction of public buildings.

Mr. ARENTZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEAD. Yes.

Mr. ARENTZ. Was the gentleman one of those who went down to Mr. Roop's office to inquire about the expenditure of a sufficient amount of funds to carry on the building program?

Mr. MEAD. I went down to the Federal Building Commission time and again with my colleagues urging the construction of Federal buildings when they were needed, where the rentals paid by the Government are exorbitant. Such building would relieve unemployment. It could be justified by the saving in rentals. It could be done at less cost at a time like this. The construction of public buildings that would last for a hundred years would not be a bad business investment, particularly in this terrible crisis when men and women are virtually destitute all over America. The public-building program was stopped by the administration, and I hope the leadership of this House will bring out such a bill and give us a chance to vote upon it that will be fair to the Members supporting this measure who come from our cities.

Mr. ARENTZ. What Mr. Roop failed to do and would not do has since been done by the President of the United States.

Mr. MEAD. I can not yield further. The President of the United States some years ago sent the Governor of Maine to

a conference down in Louisiana to inform the country of the benefits of public construction in times like this. He seemed to have a patent on the cure for unemployment then; for years he maintained it was good policy in a crisis such as this to build Federal buildings, Federal highways, river and harbor projects, and other necessary public works, but now we are informed he opposes the very plan he himself advocated then.

LABOR FOUND TO RECEIVE MOST OF HIGHWAY-PAVING FUNDS

In a recent statement issued by the Bureau of Public Roads we are advised that at least 85 per cent of the money expended for a concrete pavement is ultimately paid out in wages and salaries. Even if it is not quite that percentage, road building is one of the best means of relieving unemployment. Unless we carry on this program, thousands of workers who were employed last year will be added to the 8,000,000 unemployed workers of our country.

EMERGENCY FUND FOR ROAD BUILDING

The most significant item in the emergency Federal fund of last year was the \$80,000,000 for road building. This amount was advanced to the States in order to enable them to meet the Federal-aid allotment which was increased from seventy-five to one hundred and twenty-five million dollars. Many of the States had practically exhausted their road funds in 1930 in an effort to meet the unemployment situation. Without the special emergency fund they would not have been able to secure any Federal aid last year.

INCREASE IN ROAD BUILDING

The total Federal expenditures for road building in 1931 were \$259,897,000, an increase of \$154,000,000 over 1930. The increased Federal expenditures, however, did not bring a proportionate increase in the total road-building program of the country. It brought an increase of only \$34,000,000 which meant a drop of \$120,000,000 in State and local expenditures for this purpose.

ROAD BUILDING AND UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF

Road building has been a most effective method of unemployment relief during the depression. The various State highway commissions have made a special effort to organize their programs to meet the needs of the unemployed. Among the States that have given special attention to unemployment relief in their highway programs are New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, New Jersey, Delaware, Oregon, and Nebraska. On August 15 the State of Pennsylvania added 20,000 miles of township roads to its highway system. Construction work was started immediately on 1,700 miles of roads in 66 counties of the State. Work was also begun this fall in the reconditioning of 5,000 miles of road taken over by the highway department. The department cooperates with the various local relief organizations in relieving the unemployed.

"In order to provide winter unemployment relief for approximately 30,000 workers," writes the State highway commissioner of Michigan, "this department is rapidly placing under construction a \$10,000,000 road-construction program consisting mostly of grading drainage structures, grade separations, and bridges. A large number of projects are now being placed under construction. In order to insure that the work as specified shall be carried on this winter the department has estimated the amount of each contract that can be carried on during the winter and is requiring that the contractor shall have the percentages estimated completed on or before April 1, 1932. The department is including in the special provisions set up in the proposals that a definite amount of equipment be used, stipulating some work for hand labor. * * * In order to provide the maximum number of men with work the department requires that to the fullest extent possible all employees on State highway projects shall work part time either three days a week, or alternate weeks. In connection with the employment it is specified that the contractor shall employ not less than 75 per cent of all labor used on the work from lists of unemployed furnished by the State employment commission through its local committees and that a minimum wage of 35 cents an hour be paid. Projects are being placed as far as possible according to the urgency of the need for unemployment relief. * * *

CHARACTERISTICS OF ROAD PROGRAMS

The road programs of Michigan are fairly typical of the programs that have been adopted by a number of States for the relief of unemployment. Certain general characteristics stand out in these programs:

First. An effort is made to spread the work over as large an area as possible.

Second. As far as practicable, projects are undertaken in places in which the need for unemployment relief is greatest.

Third. There is a very pronounced tendency to substitute hand labor for machinery. In two States this tendency has assumed an extreme form. It represents a sincere effort on the part of the public authorities to provide work for the largest number of men with the limited resources at their disposal.

Fourth. In State road programs there seems to be a general policy of staggering labor.

Fifth. When work is done by contractors the State highway commission specifies a minimum rate of wages for workers.

Sixth. The workers employed on the various projects are selected on the basis of need, usually on the recommendations of local social agencies.

Seventh. Under the emergency programs road building, which heretofore was regarded as a seasonal occupation, is continued on an all-year-round basis.

ROAD BUILDING AND EMPLOYMENT

The emergency Federal fund of last year was of very great assistance to the States in speeding up their road programs and in providing work for the unemployed. The total number of men employed in Federal and State road work increased from 148,600 in January, 1931, to 365,000 in June, 1931. For every person employed directly in road work at least two other persons are employed indirectly by industries applying and transporting road material. It is, therefore, perfectly safe to assume that a total of 1,095,000 were given employment directly or indirectly on Federal and State road projects last June.

POSSIBILITY OF MAINTAINING LAST YEAR'S PACE

The maintaining of last year's pace in road building throughout this next year is a matter of vital concern to all persons interested in unemployment relief. Nothing would aggravate the unemployment situation so much as a large falling off in road building, and yet this is the situation with which we are threatened. The Federal funds available for road building last year amounted to \$259,000,000. The funds available for the next year will be approximately \$175,000,000. There is, moreover, good reason for believing that the States will not be able to match a considerable part of the Federal-aid funds. There is approximately \$75,000,000 of Federal road funds in the Treasury at present that the States are unable to match. Last year there was a decrease of \$120,000,000 in local and State expenditures for road building. Everything points to a further decrease next year. Last year the State of Michigan had approximately \$30,000,000 available for road building. For this present year \$15,000,000 will be available. Ohio anticipates a decrease of 20 per cent in its State and local programs. A number of the Southern and Middle Western States anticipate a decided decrease in their road funds. One of the very important factors in the falling off of State and local road programs is the tendency to divert the gasoline tax to purposes other than road building.

FEDERAL BUILDING PROGRAM

While road building offers the most immediate hope for an accelerated Federal program of public work there are many other types of work to which the Federal Government is committed in which considerable acceleration is possible. In 1926 Congress inaugurated a large Federal building program. As finally approved the program included 1,085 buildings at places now without Federal buildings, 245 new buildings at places that now have buildings, 191 extensions to existing Federal buildings, 41 projects for marine hospital and quarantine-station accommodations and 62 miscellaneous projects. The program was to be completed in 1937 at an estimated cost of \$620,000,000. This program has been carried out at an accelerated pace particularly during the past year. The total amount expended to December 31 was \$189,994,324.72. With increased appropriations and authorizations the program could be accelerated

at a more rapid rate during the next year. Of \$620,000,000 Congress has authorized the expenditure of \$486,089,300.09 and has appropriated \$238,527,621.98. If Congress would appropriate the total amount authorized and would grant authorization for the buildings that have been approved, the program could be accelerated very materially in the next year.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the amendment close in five minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to address myself to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TAYLOR]. I feel some interest in this amendment, because it not only affects my district but it affects a great national enterprise. I am sorry that my colleague [Mr. WARREN] does not see this matter as we see it. It is a very simple proposition.

Under the act of May 22, 1926, the Government is authorized to take over and establish the great Smoky Mountains National Park. The lands to constitute that park were to be acquired by the States of North Carolina and Tennessee. Pursuant to the act of May 22, 1926, the State of North Carolina appropriated \$2,000,000 from its treasury and the State of Tennessee appropriated an equal amount from its treasury for the purpose of acquiring the lands. This was not sufficient. The Rockefeller Foundation came to the aid of the two States and agreed to expend \$5,000,000 to aid in this great national enterprise. Under this situation the States have acquired nearly 400,000 acres of the property, acquiring the great backbone of the Smoky Range as a national park. There are just a few condemnation proceedings yet undecided which are necessary to complete the 428,000 acres necessary to be taken over when the Federal Government would establish the park just as any other national park.

Mr. FULLER. Since this is a measure to grant relief for roads that are already in the Federal road system and there are no Federal roads or trails in this park—

Mr. WEAVER. Oh, yes; there are.

Mr. FULLER. But they are not in the system. How can the gentleman hope to get any benefit from the amendment?

Mr. WEAVER. One of the great roads into the park comes under this amendment.

Mr. FULLER. That is true. We have general authority under the terms of the bill, without specifying this particular park as the park named in the amendment.

Mr. WEAVER. But it says for the reconstruction and improvement of roads and trails, inclusive of necessary bridges in the national parks, and so forth. All we ask you to do is to say that instead of confining it to national parks already established, it shall apply to those which are in process of establishment, and especially in this case where the Government owns in fee nearly 400,000 acres of land which has been turned over to it under deeds now of record in the several counties, and let them build these roads and trails. The National Park Service wants this. The Director of National Parks is now in full control of the property conveyed to the United States by North Carolina and Tennessee. A superintendent has been appointed and rangers are now in charge of the property. For administration purposes, the National Park Service now has complete supervision and control, but under the act of May 22, 1926, the process of development would have to await the acquisition of the full 428,000 acres.

Mr. LEAVITT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEAVER. I yield.

Mr. LEAVITT. I agree with the gentleman. That is one of the finest parks in the entire system. It seems to me there is authority to do that already on the land that has been taken under jurisdiction by the Park Service. The bill reads: "The national parks or national monuments under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior," this work may be done. A very considerable portion of the Great Smokies are now under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. WEAVER. If we were sure that that was true, we would not have offered the amendment?

Mr. LEAVITT. If I am not correct, I am in favor of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. WEAVER. I have an amendment which I got from the Park Service. I at one time thought that this would take care of the situation, but I find the legal advisers of the Department say it will not, and for that reason the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TAYLOR] and myself have interested ourselves in this legislation.

Mr. LEAVITT. I shall vote for the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. WEAVER. It does not add anything to the amount to be appropriated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TAYLOR].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto be closed in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from North Carolina.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

I rise to make a few remarks on the basis of the tables that have been handed out this afternoon. I was glad, indeed, to find only one man from a State which would be called upon to pay more than it would receive in benefit take the floor in support of this legislation.

I was in Canada recently and I watched them build scores of miles of dirt roads. There I found people living in communities which received real benefits from road construction, because the work was chiefly manual. But I can picture in my mind roads being built in some sparsely settled sections of our country, and the picture is entirely different. On the day the contractor arrives with his 5-ton trucks and all the rest of his machinery he brings with him from 15 to 25 men who drive the trucks and serve as mechanics. These few men—generally workmen from outside the locality—will do all the work involved in building that road, and the native population will watch it done and curse the machines which are doing it. I have seen that very thing happen. How much benefit, in the sense of unemployment relief, do you bring to such communities with that sort of contract work?

The title of this bill indicates that it is supposed to be an aid to employment. I fancy that is not it. Under a plea of unemployment you would primarily be getting a lot of good roads everywhere at the expense of a few States. As some of the speakers earlier this afternoon said, there is certainly a lot of bait in this bill. There might have been a great deal more bait in it if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan had been in order, because certainly such a proposition as this ought to be according to population so that each section would get its fair and proportionate share.

I repeat that, in spite of the argument by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. COLTON] to the effect that in building the machinery and transporting it to other places you are increasing employment, this is negligible in comparison with the cost involved. You may increase the number which will be benefited a little more, but there is a vast difference between 25 per cent and 90 per cent. But in most localities to which you are trying to bring relief from unemployment the benefits would be almost negligible, under the present contract system, even with the amendment relating to paying the prevailing rate of wages. Contractors will bring their own help, and while they will pay the prevailing rate of wages, they will not hire labor locally in any material number. Machines, not men, will do most of the work, especially not the men of each different neighborhood where the roads are being built. You are very

much mistaken if you think that this will not be the case. Surely you must know you are not bringing about something to help unemployment. You are taking advantage of the unemployment to get a lot of good roads at the expense of a few States which will have to bear the major burden of the cost, and which, in turn, will receive almost no benefit. This is illogical and unfair. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired on this section.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. If an amendment in the form of a new section is offered at this time, will it be subject to debate?

The CHAIRMAN. The private opinion of the present occupant of the chair is that it would not be subject to debate, but the parliamentarian believes otherwise, and the Chair will so rule. The Chair will rule that it is subject to debate if it is offered as a new section.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, then I offer an amendment, as a new section.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington, [Mr. SUMMERS] offers an amendment as a new section, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: On page 3, after line 20, insert a new section, as follows:

"Sec. 2 (b) That for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Federal highway act, approved November 9, 1921, and all acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, and to establish post roads, provide for the common defense and general welfare, there is hereby authorized to be allocated by Congress out of any money herein authorized to be appropriated to be expended in the improvement of rural post roads over which rural carriers travel in serving the rural routes in addition to those roads now or hereafter to be included in the Federally aided road system.

"The sums of money appropriated by Congress under authority of this act shall be apportioned by the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States among the several States in proportion to the total mileage of rural routes within the respective States and shall be available only when and upon condition that the several States, or subdivisions therein, or both, appropriate and make available an equal sum exclusively for the same purpose. The expenditure of all such sums of money shall be made by the highway departments of the several States or by the equivalent office or officer thereof, as provided in the Federal highway act of November 9, 1921, or such agencies as the said State departments may respectively direct.

"That section 6 of said Federal highway act is hereby amended, authorizing and creating a third class of highways to consider both those intracounty and intercounty highways over which passes the United States mail by rural mail carriers, first selecting and improving those roads which shall most usefully and conveniently contribute to rounding out and expanding the system of primary and secondary highways, and to continue enlarging and expanding until all rural mail routes shall be improved in the manner decided by the respective State highway departments."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk has not finished reading the amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. It has proceeded far enough to show that it is clearly out of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Chairman, I hate to interrupt the reading of the amendment but it is so clearly subject to a point of order, on account of its nongermaneness, that I therefore must make the point of order.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Will the gentleman reserve his point of order and permit just a few more lines to be read?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Washington desire to be heard on the point of order? If so, the Chair will hear the gentleman briefly.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration is to aid in the construction of highways—federally aided highways. Presumably we get that authority from certain provisions of the Constitution of the United States, and the amendment I have offered is founded on precisely those same provisions of the Constitution. My amendment specifically refers to post roads. The bill under

consideration is somewhat mystical as to whether post roads or other roads are to be built.

They both call for cooperation by the States; they both serve the same purpose; they both trace back to the same provisions in the Constitution. No new provision is set out or contemplated by the amendment which I have offered. The money comes from the same source. It is spent under the direction of the same authorities—both Federal and State. It must be expended under those same authorities; it is to accomplish the same purpose; and, as far as I can see, is identical in purpose through and through.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The bill before the committee is for a specific purpose, and is limited as follows:

No sums apportioned under this act shall be advanced except for work on the Federal-aid highway system performed before June 30, 1933.

The gentleman's amendment carries legislation of a general nature that is not germane to the purposes of the bill, and the Chair, therefore, sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 3. That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make rules and regulations for carrying out the provisions of this act with the view of providing the maximum employment consistent with reasonable economy of construction.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. WARREN: On page 3, line 24, after the word "employment," insert the words "of local labor."

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I desire to inquire of the gentleman in charge of the bill as to what he means by the words "of local labor." Would that include the State in which the work is to be done or only the community where the road is being built?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I may state in answer to the gentleman's question that the intent of the committee in offering this amendment was that local labor in the community generally, and certainly in the State where the work was being done, would be used.

Mr. DYER. That is what I was afraid of. Those who come from the cities, to which none of this proposed appropriation is allocated, will not benefit. The people of the big cities will not benefit, because the work is to be done by local labor in the locality where the road is to be built.

In other words, it is class legislation and will not in any respect help the people of the whole State to which the money goes. None of it will go to the large cities and they will receive no benefit whatever from it. The Appropriations Committee of the House has brought in amendments to their appropriation bills to provide that certain employees of the Government shall have their pay reduced. That has been done already in bills that have passed the House and that are now pending. In every instance those people live in the large cities.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DYER. Yes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not true that appropriations for the construction of Government buildings, including court and post-office buildings, provide only for employment in the cities and in industrial cities generally?

Mr. DYER. No. That is not in the bills of which I have knowledge, that employment shall only be given to the people living in the particular city.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. But is it not true that, as a matter of fact, the employment is largely restricted to the places where those works are being constructed?

Mr. DYER. The contractors for public buildings in my city bring a vast amount of their equipment and a large number of employees from other cities. I think it most unjust, Mr. Chairman, to legislate in this way. I think it is

unjust to take money away from the people of the big cities and transfer it to the building of roads in States where the people of the cities, who pay a large part of the taxes, receive no benefits therefrom.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not true that under this legislation ultimately 50 per cent of the cost is paid by the local communities?

Mr. DYER. If that were true, it would be a different proposition, but under this bill there is evidently no intention of having the States pay back any of this money.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not true of this bill, as it was of a similar bill passed by this House in 1930, that every dollar that may be advanced to any State must be repaid out of the funds accruing to that State in the future? So each State does make a local contribution after all, does it not?

Mr. DYER. My State will pay its part, of course, but it receives no benefit from this bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DYER. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Under the prior act to which the gentleman refers the money will be apportioned for repayment to the National Government up to 1938, but under this bill it is proposed to have this money apportioned from 1938 to 1948. However, the States will first have to appropriate, and if they do not appropriate the National Government alone will bear the expense which is supposed to be borne by the local communities. So if the States do not make the appropriations from 1938 to 1948—and they are not likely to do so—then the National Government is building the roads itself.

Mr. DYER. That is quite true, Mr. Chairman, and shows the great injustice of this legislation which is brought here on the pretense that it is going to provide work for a number of people. It will benefit very few, and the Democratic Party, which has been here urging economy and reducing the pay of Government employees in the appropriation bills, comes in here now with this large bill to eventually saddle almost all of this amount on the taxpayers of the entire country, including the people whom I have the honor in part to represent.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMASON: Page 3, line 25, after the word "construction," strike out the period, insert a colon, and add the following:

"And provided, That none shall be employed except citizens of the United States."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Chairman, the committee will accept that amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the committee has just adopted as its amendment the committee amendment with respect to local labor and that the amendment that is now proposed seeks to modify and change the amendment just adopted. The appropriate time for the amendment to have been proposed was before the committee amendment was agreed to, because it is an amendment to that amendment, involving the principle of local labor.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The question raised by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] is one of consistency, on which the Chair does not pass.

The point of order is overruled, and the gentleman from Texas is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, as I understand, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WARREN] has stated that the committee accepts the amendment, and for that reason I do not desire recognition.

The question was taken; and on a division, demanded by Mr. STAFFORD, there were—ayes 142, noes 7.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOGG of Indiana, Mr. LaGUARDIA, and Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri rose.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. There was an amendment offered to section 2, and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WARREN] said he would accept it as an amendment to section 3.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] in a moment. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOGG], who has not spoken on the bill.

Mr. HOGG of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOGG of Indiana: Page 3, line 25, following the amendment just adopted, add as follows:

"That all contracts entered into before June 30, 1933, and providing for the payment of any funds authorized or appropriated by this act, shall contain a provision that in the making of any excavation and in the construction of any grade or fill the material removed from such excavation or placed in any grade or fill shall not be loaded at such excavation, grade, or fill into trucks, lifts, or conveyors by means of power-driven machinery, except in the case of stone, heavy individual objects, and material beneath the water surface."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment that it is not germane, and that it is contradictory of the method of doing the work as provided in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOGG] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. HOGG of Indiana. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, if the Chair will permit, I wish to reinforce the argument that I made a moment ago, because it is applicable to the amendment that is pending.

The committee adopted an amendment that relates to the way the money shall be used, namely, by means of local labor. It was possible, under the rules of the House, at any time prior to the adoption of that amendment, to offer any germane amendment; but when the committee adopted the amendment it foreclosed itself, then and there, from proposing any amendment that was germane or related to the subject of local labor. The amendment now proposed is one relating to the labor that will be employed in the utilization of these appropriations. I claim the amendment comes too late. The time for the amendment was before the committee had adopted an amendment determining the policy with respect to employment.

The CHAIRMAN. Unless the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOGG] desires to be heard, the Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. HOGG of Indiana. If the Chair please, the section provides for labor of a local nature, and this simply provides for one of the ways in which it can be done.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The question raised now is different from that raised by the gentleman from Wisconsin, which merely raised the question of consistency. This is an amendment to an amendment that has already been adopted by the House, and clearly is subject to the point of order. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 25, strike out the period, insert a comma and the following: "and such regulations shall provide for the predetermination of the prevailing wage scale provided for in section 1 hereof, and the inclusion of the same in the specifications and contracts."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is the identical question the Chair has passed upon, and the identical amendment proposed to section 1 of this bill; that it seeks to change the method of doing this public work to relieve unemployment.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The point of order made before was that it was an amendment to an amendment already adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. On February 24, 1921, when the gentleman from New Jersey was in the chair, this same question was raised, and he ruled as follows:

The amendment offered by the gentleman is an amendment to an amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio and should have been offered before the original amendment was passed upon.

That being on all fours with the recent ruling of the Chair, the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I wish to say to the Chair that I was on my feet when the gentleman from Texas offered his amendment. I was a member of the committee, but the Chair recognized the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] when I was entitled to priority.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the ruling is based on the fact that there was a committee amendment adopted by the House, which would be equally applicable to the point of order.

Mr. RAMSPECK. My amendment had no relation to the committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. It was the privilege of the gentleman from Georgia, if he so desired, to offer it as an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I ask that my amendment, under the agreement with the gentleman from North Carolina, be now read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 25, after the word "construction," strike out the period, insert a colon and the following: "Provided, That none of the money herein authorized to be appropriated shall be paid to any State on account of any project on which convict labor shall be employed."

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Chairman, the committee accepts that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate upon this section and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri: Page 3, line 24, after the word "labor," insert a comma and add the following: "the minimum use of machinery and the use of equipment and material of domestic manufacture and production."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order to that for the same reason. This involves a matter of labor and that matter has been passed on. It is an amendment to an amendment and comes too late.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this bill, according to the title, is "To authorize supplemental appropriations for emergency highway construction, with a view to increasing employment." The purpose of section 3 is to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make rules and regulations for carrying out the provisions of the act, with a view of providing a maximum employment of local labor. My amendment seeks to take out of this picture the steam shovel and the concrete mixer and require contractors to use domestic material. What more can be done to provide employment for those who are looking for work than to get rid of machinery and require those who are constructing the roads to use material manufactured in the United States and not in Belgium and other countries? In December Belgian cement was purchased by a contractor to make a road in the Canal Zone, 10,000 barrels. They use Belgian cement in States along our coast, and I want to prevent the use of Government money for this purpose. No point of order should be made against an amendment that will give Americans work in preference to men in foreign countries. Let us take care of the American unemployed, and let the foreign countries take care of their own. We

have done enough for them. Do you ever see them helping us?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair can not pass on the merits of the proposition. He has already cited the precedent established by the ruling of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LEHLBACH] on a question on all fours with this, which held that the gentleman's amendment should have been offered at the time the committee amendment was under consideration. As it is an amendment to an amendment that has been adopted, it is not in order, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph. We are considering a bill here to help the unemployed. The committee amendment assists those who live in the vicinity of the job, but I seek to go further than the committee and give more work by prohibiting the use of machinery in the construction of roads known as Federal-aid highways. First, by my amendment I attempted to prevent the use of machinery on Federal-aid roads. If you really want to help the unemployed, place my amendment in the bill, and you will be doing something worth while. Next, I attempted to prevent the use of Belgian cement, as this country has the best cement in the world, and because Belgian cement is manufactured by cheap labor and can be bought more cheaply in the United States than domestic cement. As I said a few moments ago, the States along the Atlantic coast and other States have been using Belgian cement, and in December 10,000 barrels of Belgian cement were purchased by a contractor to be used on the roads in the Canal Zone. You say you are passing legislation here to help the unemployed, still you seem willing to let the men stand around the job and watch the steam shovel and the concrete mixer doing this work and human beings wondering whether they are going to get money to buy something for their starving children and pay rent. I am surprised that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] objects to an amendment of that character. If you really want to help the unemployed, you will do it by putting the machinery out, and if you do not put the machinery out it will not be long before the unemployed will do it for you. Honest men, able and willing to work, are entitled to work, and the time is not far distant when they will see that they will get it. They are not going to let their families want for necessities of life.

Mr. WELCH of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Always to my friend from California—to be more direct, from San Francisco—a city that recently provided that there would be no steam shovel or concrete mixer on some public work. I know the working man has no better friend in Congress than Mr. WELCH.

Mr. WELCH of California. If the gentleman's amendment prevailed, as I was in hopes it would, it would give work to idle men instead of idle steam shovels and concrete mixers.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Absolutely. As the gentleman recently told me, one steam shovel will do the work of fifty or a hundred men, depending upon its size. Steam shovels do not need food, clothes, nor shelter, but the unemployed do, and some way must be found to give it to them.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. On all matters of this kind it is primarily for the States to determine. I answer the gentleman by saying that my opposition to his amendment is based upon the ground that I think the States that contribute 50 per cent of this fund ought to have the final voice as to how the money will be disbursed.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Does the gentleman from Mississippi approve of the act of contractors in the State of Arkansas that paid their labor on roads last year 75 cents?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I do not. Section 3 of the bill provides that the Secretary of Agriculture shall provide for a maximum of local labor and the elimination of as much machinery as possible.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Not for the elimination of machinery. That is what I wanted to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, under unanimous consent to speak for two minutes I can say very little concerning H. R. 9642, being a bill making further appropriations for highway construction.

This is another time when we are called upon to vote upon a measure involving many millions of dollars without having been given sufficient time to consider the subject. I call the attention of the House to the fact that the bill was reported from the committee day before yesterday. Indeed, the hearings before the committee, and I think this is true of the report also, were not available until about noon to-day. We have not been given opportunity to consult the highway officers or the highway commissions in our several States. We know not how we will be affected by the bill. Take Iowa, for example. The road program for 1932 has already been made up, or practically so. Can this program under existing conditions be modified or changed. I can not say. I have had no opportunity to find out. I do believe, however, that even were we so minded we could not get much help this year from the appropriations involved. And the bill by its own limitations prevents a Northern State like Iowa from performing much work next year, because the time limit for the work terminates in June, 1933; and we will have only something like two and a half months of available workable time next year within which to do the work contemplated by the esteemed author of this bill, who hails from the sun-kissed slopes of Alabama, where work can be commenced very early in each year and can be prosecuted thereafter practically the whole time.

Furthermore, I call the attention of the House to the fact that the ranking minority member of the Committee on Roads is sick and not able to be here to-day. I understand also that he was not able to be present in the committee during the consideration of the measure.

Mr. WARREN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILCHRIST. I yield.

Mr. WARREN. I wish to assure the gentleman that the ranking minority member did appear at the hearing on this bill.

Mr. GILCHRIST. I accept the statement of the gentleman. I was advised by one Member that he was not present. In any event the gentleman is not here. He is my colleague from Iowa. We want and should have time to consult him. We have not been able to do so, and before Members are called upon to vote for the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars I think it would be fair to give them sufficient time to consider the proposition. For one, I am growing rather tired of being compelled to vote upon measures without having had time to look into them. I say this in all kindness to the committee. Why not allow us opportunity to consult our constituents and public officers who have charge of these matters at home? Why not allow us a chance to take the advice of the minority ranking committeeman, who might have something to say about the measure, and who could at all events give us some information about the conditions existing in our home States?

I do not oppose good roads. It is clearly within the jurisdiction of Congress to establish post roads, and appropriations therefor are not opposed by those of us who are against the present bill. But we have heretofore taken care of this matter by liberal appropriations voted by the House. The usual program respecting these things is fully provided for. The Federal appropriations for road building in 1931 were increased many millions of dollars over those of 1930, and the Federal Government has been very generous in regard to this subject. The deficiency appropriation bill already passed by the House gave liberal Federal aid to public roads and millions of dollars were allocated to that purpose by that bill. The appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture gave many millions more for the same purpose. We have done, and we will yet do, our full duty in aiding Federal highways and the primary systems of the States. There is no emergency on that subject. The regular program is sufficient.

But, Mr. Chairman, this bill is just another raid on the United States Treasury. I am under no illusions as to the 50-50 proposition contained herein. I know that any dollar

which is raised by taxes in Iowa, and is then rolled down here to this great Capital at Washington into the hands of bureaucratic commissions and afterwards rolled back for expenditures out there, will suffer great and grievous attrition. I know, also, that the Federal dollars which the States are to get by virtue of the bill will not drop down like manna from the heavens above but, on the contrary, they will be wrung by tax-gatherers from impoverished men and women now crying for relief. I also know that the State dollars with which to match them will come in great part from the sweat and toil of those who perform the labor and who own the farms and the homes throughout our land.

All along during this session we have been reminded of the condition of the Public Treasury. It is in the red more than \$2,000,000,000, and the figures are staggering. The Ways and Means Committee is now at work with inventive skill devising new, additional, and ingenious methods for taxing a distressed people in order that the Budget may be balanced. And this bill is but another raid. If we must spend the people's money, let us not spend it like drunken sailors upon shore leave. If we are to change the program and the precedents, and if we are to establish new procedures and make new allocations, then I call your attention to the fact that there is imperative need for something to be done to provide and keep in repair the postal routes of our rural mail carriers, as well as, and in addition to, the hundreds of thousands of miles of farm-to-market highways, so that we may furnish employment and help to revive business and make it possible for country folks to enjoy a little of the privileges which good highways bring.

There is only one way to retrench and that is to quit voting for new and additional appropriations. There is only one way to amend the situation and that is to lop off subsidies. There is only one way to economize and that is to quit spending money. There is only one way to reduce taxes and that is to reduce taxation. There is to-day in this country an awful and tragic need for retrenchment, because economic disaster stalks the land like a pestilence at noon-day. There is no imperative need for establishing a new policy regarding Federal highways, however grateful these might be in the sunny times of prosperity. The bill brings no relief to the ruined farms of this country but rather sends the tax gatherer out to levy further tribute upon them and to put additional imposts against them. The way to reform is to reform. The structure of the bill is such that the States themselves must raise like sums of money. This means taxation. This means bonds and more tax-free bonds so that children in swaddling clothes and even generations yet unborn will be compelled to underwrite and pay for the folly and asininity of their fathers. Oh, we can be mighty fearless in visiting our sins upon those who shall come after us.

Since I came here I have heard much about the great god, Demos; about the rights of the people of the States; about Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson and other men who have stood in the path of monarchy and autocracy and bureaucracy to defend the people and the rights of the people of each State. But here is a bill which will bribe the legislature of every State against their own right of self-determination. It stultifies their conscience. This money is like the 30 pieces of silver that bought Judas and if any State does not take the money, then it will be penalized in favor of the States which do stultify themselves. If, on the other hand, any State accepts the money, then it will be expected to spend dollar for dollar like sums of money upon like Federal highways.

The sums now to be advanced by Uncle Sam are to be reimbursed to him over a period of 10 years, commencing with 1938, by the making of deductions from regular apportionments which the State might otherwise obtain in the future. The scheme is nicely tied up until 1948. Who knows whether the next Congress or whether the Seventy-fourth Congress will continue the Federal highway appropriations upon a 50-50 basis? What right have we to tie the hands of the Seventy-ninth Congress or any other Congress? What right have we to impose our will upon the legislatures of the several States for the ensuing two decades? Let every

Congressman when he comes to vote look to his commission and to his oath and inquire whether the authority exists, and from whence it emanates, that gives him leave to do this thing! Who can guarantee that any State after drawing this bribe will 10 or 15 years hereafter carry out the nefarious arrangement by paying its allotments? When gentlemen talk about democracy, let them not act as autocrats, and let them not dictate the policies of future Congresses and of future legislatures throughout the country.

I may well agree that this is an emergency measure, but the emergency is one in the future, because it establishes new precedents and creates new imposts and levies additional tribute upon a tax-suffering people, and it fixes such tribute upon them for a period of almost two decades yet to come.

Let us temper our present greed with a wholesome fear for future consequences. Let us no longer create in State and local agencies a spirit of parasitic dependence on the National Government. This will necessarily lead to wastefulness in local administration. Let us not discount the future. Let us not mortgage posterity. Let us not be prodigal, for if we do the time is surely coming when we will eat husks.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. There is a committee amendment which should be read at this time. The Clerk will read the committee amendment.

The Clerk read the committee amendment as follows:

SEC. 4. The last paragraph of section 6 of the Federal highway act, approved November 9, 1921 (42 Stat. 212; U. S. C., title 23, sec. 6), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Whenever provision has been made by any State for the completion and maintenance of 90 per cent of its system of primary or interstate and secondary or intercounty highways equal to 7 per cent of the total mileage of such State, as required by this act, said State, through its State highway department, by and with the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture, is hereby authorized to increase the mileage of the primary or interstate and secondary or intercounty systems by additional mileage equal to not more than 1 per cent of said total mileage of such State, and thereafter to make like increases in the mileage of said systems whenever provision has been made for the completion and maintenance of 90 per cent of the mileage of said systems previously authorized in accordance herewith."

The CHAIRMAN. Did the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] desire to offer an amendment as a new section following section 3 before the committee amendment was adopted?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes; I did, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will then report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAMSPECK: Page 3, line 25, after section 3, insert a new paragraph:

"3 (a) The prevailing scale of wages provided for in section 1 hereof shall be predetermined and included as a part of the specifications upon which each contract is awarded, and shall be a part of the contract."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The same point of order that was made to this amendment when it was previously offered to section 1 of the bill, namely, that this bill contemplates the expenditure of these funds under the Federal highway act, and the method proposed is an entirely different and inconsistent method of expending these funds. It is not germane and it is thoroughly inconsistent.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard upon the point of order.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGUARDIA] made a part of section 1 of this bill the principles of the Bacon-Davis Act. The amendment which I have proposed simply means that in applying the Bacon-Davis Act, or applying the prevailing wage scale to these contracts, it shall be determined in advance of the letting of

the contract and made a part of the contract. It does not change the method which is prescribed by the bill of having paid the prevailing wage scale, but it will simply enable a contractor who bids on the work to know exactly what he is going to have to pay for wages when he makes his bid and not put him in the position of making a bid and then having the Government officials come around and say "You have to pay higher wages than you thought you had to pay."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. This, Mr. Chairman, is not germane to the section.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The amendment would have been germane to section 1, because it applies to section 1. The amendment is not germane to the bill at this point, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ALLGOOD: Page 3, line 24, after the word "labor," strike out the period, insert a comma and the following words: "and the use of farmers' teams and the use of local materials."

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on this amendment, that it is not germane and it comes too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's amendment comes too late. It should have been offered to section 3 before section 4 was adopted. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to section 3 for the purpose of offering an amendment.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: Page 3, after the last amendment adopted to section 3, strike out the period, add a colon and the following: "Provided, There is hereby authorized to be allocated funds out of any money by Congress herein authorized to be appropriated, to be expended in the improvement of rural post roads over which rural carriers travel in serving the rural routes in addition to those roads now or hereafter to be included in the federally aided road system."

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, all I am trying to accomplish is to get some farm-to-market post roads that will employ the maximum of labor. I have left out all legislation in this amendment. I am not able to see why it should be subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will rule that section 4 having been adopted by the committee the gentleman's amendment is not germane. It comes too late.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. If the Chair will permit, I repeatedly endeavored to get recognition at the end of section 3. So far as I was able to determine they began the reading of amendments to section 4 before it had been reached.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington had the privilege of offering his amendment at any time as a perfecting amendment. It is incumbent upon the Chair to recognize members of the committee in preference to other Members.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I know that, but I did not know we had passed section 3.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will sustain the point of order.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer the amendment at the end of the bill. It calls for no additional money and it is only for the purpose of

getting rural farm-to-market roads. That is all I have been striving for during the afternoon. I have in mind the construction of some \$2,000 or \$3,000 mile roads as well as \$30,000 or \$40,000 mile roads.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington offers his amendment as a new section at the end of the bill. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SUMMERS of Washington as a new section.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Chairman, as I understand, this is exactly the same amendment which has just been offered and I make a point of order against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Provided, There is hereby authorized to be allocated funds out of any money by Congress herein authorized to be appropriated to be expended in the improvement of rural post roads over which rural carriers travel in serving the rural routes in addition to those roads now or hereafter to be included in the federally aided road system.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Chairman, I renew the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will sustain the point of order. If the amendment is germane at all it should have been offered to section 2.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on this bill to-day be allowed to revise and extend their remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry. I do not intend to object to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina, but I would like recognition to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Montana desires the attention of the gentleman from North Carolina as to a correction in the bill.

Mr. LEAVITT. Mr. Chairman, on page 2, line 9, are found these words:

No sums apportioned under this act shall be advanced except for work—

And so on. In my judgment the word "act" at the beginning of line 10 should be "section," because in section 2 there are five other purposes, including the construction and improvement of national-forest highways; construction and maintenance of roads, trails, bridges, and so forth, in the national forests; the construction and improvement of roads and trails within national parks; the construction and improvement of Indian-reservation roads, and the survey, construction, and maintenance of main roads through unappropriated or reserved public land. So if we leave the language as it is in section 1 there might be some conflict between the language of the first section and of the second section.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the gentleman, it does occur to me that the word "act" is properly used. It only refers to the apportionments made to the several States out of this emergency fund, and has no reference to the section to which the gentleman refers.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hold that the parliamentary inquiry has been answered. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the committee automatically rises.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BLANTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9642) to authorize supplemental appropriations for emergency highway construction, with a view to increasing employment, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri offers a motion to recommit. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I am, Mr. Speaker, in its present form.

The SPEAKER. Is any member of the committee opposed to the bill? If not, the Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Roads with instruction to that committee to report the bill back to the House forthwith with the following amendment: On page 3, line 24, after the word "labor," insert a comma and add the following: "the minimum use of machinery and the use of equipment and material of domestic manufacture and production."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the House has just adopted a committee amendment found on page 3, line 24, which provides as to local labor being the character of labor that should be employed in the use of these funds. The House having adopted that amendment, it is now too late to offer any germane amendment such as proposed in the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The point is well taken, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 205, nays 109, answered "present" 5, not voting 112, as follows:

[Roll No. 23]

YEAS—205

Abernethy	Disney	Karch	Oliver, Ala.
Allgood	Dominick	Keller	Overton
Almon	Douglass, Mass.	Kelly, Pa.	Owens
Amle	Doxey	Kemp	Parker, Ga.
Arentz	Drane	Kerr	Parks
Arnold	Drewry	Kleberg	Parsons
Auf der Heide	Driver	Kniffin	Patterson
Bankhead	Eaton, Colo.	Kvale	Peavey
Barbour	Englebright	LaGuardia	Pittenger
Barton	Erk	Lambeth	Polk
Bland	Eslick	Lamneck	Pou
Blanton	Estep	Lanham	Prall
Bloom	Evans, Calif.	Lankford, Ga.	Rainey
Bolleau	Fernandez	Larsen	Ramspeck
Boland	Fiesinger	Lea	Rankin
Bowman	Fish	Leavitt	Rayburn
Brand, Ga.	Fitzpatrick	Lewis	Reilly
Browning	Flannagan	Lichtenwalner	Sanders, Tex.
Buchanan	Frear	Linthicum	Sandlin
Bulwinkle	Fulbright	Loneragan	Schafer
Burch	Fuller	Loofbourow	Schneider
Busby	Fulmer	Lovette	Selvig
Butler	Gasque	Lozier	Shallenberger
Campbell, Pa.	Gilbert	McClintic, Okla.	Simmons
Canfield	Glover	McCormack	Sinclair
Cannon	Goss	McDuffie	Smith, Idaho
Carter, Wyo.	Green	McFadden	Smith, Va.
Cartwright	Greenwood	McKeown	Smith, W. Va.
Caviechia	Gregory	McMillan	Spence
Chavez	Griswold	McReynolds	Steagall
Christgau	Haines	McSwain	Stevenson
Clark, N. C.	Hall, Miss.	Maas	Stewart
Collins	Hall, N. Dak.	Major	Strong, Pa.
Colton	Hancock, N. C.	Maloney	Summers, Wash.
Condon	Hardy	Manlove	Sutphin
Cooper, Tenn.	Hare	Mansfield	Swank
Cox	Hastings	Martin, Oreg.	Swing
Coyle	Hill, Ala.	May	Tarver
Cross	Hill, Wash.	Mead	Taylor, Colo.
Crosser	Hornor	Miller	Taylor, Tenn.
Crowe	Horr	Milligan	Thomason
Crump	Howard	Mitchell	Turpin
Curry	Huddleston	Montague	Warren
Davis	James	Montet	Weaver
Delaney	Jeffers	Moore, Ky.	Welch, Calif.
DeEouen	Johnson, Mo.	Morehead	West
Dickinson	Johnson, Okla.	Nelson, Wis.	White
Dies	Johnson, Tex.	Norton, Nebr.	Whittington
Dieterich	Kading	Norton, N. J.	Williams, Mo.

Williams, Tex.	Wolcott	Woodruff	Wright
Wilson	Wood, Ga.	Woodrum	Yon
Withrow			

NAYS—109

Adkins	Dallinger	Jenkins	Reed, N. Y.
Allen	Darrow	Johnson, S. Dak.	Robinson
Andresen	Davenport	Johnson, Wash.	Schuetz
Andrew, Mass.	Dyer	Jones	Shott
Andrews, N. Y.	Foss	Kahn	Snow
Ayres	French	Kelly, Ill.	Sparks
Bachmann	Garber	Ketcham	Stafford
Bacon	Gibson	Knutson	Strong, Kans.
Baldrige	Gifford	Lambertson	Swanson
Beam	Gilchrist	Lankford, Va.	Swick
Beck	Gillen	Larrabee	Thatcher
Beedy	Goodwin	Luce	Thurston
Boehne	Granata	Ludlow	Tilson
Bolton	Guyot	McGugin	Timberlake
Brumm	Hall, Ill.	McLaughlin	Tinkham
Burdick	Hancock, N. Y.	Mapes	Treadway
Burtness	Hart	Martin, Mass.	Underhill
Cable	Hess	Michener	Wason
Campbell, Iowa	Hoch	Millard	Watson
Chindblom	Hogg, Ind.	Moore, Ohio	Weeks
Chilperfield	Hollister	Nelson, Me.	Whitley
Christopherson	Holmes	Nolan	Wigglesworth
Clague	Hooper	Parker, N. Y.	Williamson
Clarke, N. Y.	Hope	Partridge	Wood, Ind.
Cochran, Pa.	Houston, Del.	Pettengill	Wyant
Cole, Iowa	Hull, Morton D.	Purnell	
Cooper, Ohio	Hull, William E.	Ramseyer	
Culkin	Jacobsen	Ransley	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—5

Cochran, Mo.	Doughton	Finley	Hawley
Crisp			

NOT VOTING—112

Aldrich	Cullen	Kennedy	Sabath
Bacharach	De Priest	Kinzer	Sanders, N. Y.
Beers	Dickstein	Kopp	Seger
Black	Douglas, Ariz.	Kurtz	Seiberling
Bohn	Doutrich	Lehlbach	Shannon
Boylan	Dowell	Lindsay	Shreve
Brand, Ohio	Eaton, N. J.	McClintock, Ohio	Sirovich
Briggs	Evans, Mont.	McLeod	Snell
Britten	Fishburne	Magrady	Somers, N. Y.
Brunner	Free	Mouser	Stalker
Buckbee	Freeman	Murphy	Stokes
Byrns	Gambrill	Nelson, Mo.	Sullivan, N. Y.
Carden	Garrett	Niedringhaus	Sullivan, Pa.
Carley	Gavagan	O'Connor	Summers, Tex.
Carter, Calif.	Golder	Oliver, N. Y.	Sweeney
Cary	Goldsborough	Palmsano	Taber
Celler	Granfield	Patman	Temple
Chapman	Griffin	Perkins	Tierney
Chase	Hadley	Person	Tucker
Clancy	Harlan	Pratt, Harcourt J.	Underwood
Cole, Md.	Hartley	Pratt, Ruth	Vestal
Collier	Haugen	Ragon	Vinson, Ga.
Connery	Hogg, W. Va.	Reid, Ill.	Vinson, Ky.
Connolly	Holaday	Rich	Welsh, Pa.
Cooke	Hopkins	Rogers, Mass.	Wingo
Corning	Igoe	Rogers, N. H.	Wolfenden
Crall	Johnson, Ill.	Romjue	Wolverton
Crowther	Kendall	Rudd	Yates

So the bill was passed.

The following pairs were announced:

On this vote:

Mr. Ragon (for) with Mr. Snell (against).
 Mr. Doughton (for) with Mr. Aldrich (against).
 Mr. Vinson of Georgia (for) with Mr. Hadley (against).
 Mr. Fishburne (for) with Mr. Shreve (against).
 Mr. Carden (for) with Mr. Wolfenden (against).
 Mr. Tierney (for) with Mr. Golder (against).
 Mr. Cole of Maryland (for) with Mr. Taber (against).
 Mr. Collier (for) with Mr. Hawley (against).
 Mr. Connery (for) with Mr. McClintock of Ohio (against).
 Mrs. Wingo (for) with Mr. Buckbee (against).
 Mr. Rogers (for) with Mr. Welsh of Pennsylvania (against).
 Mr. Goldsborough (for) with Mr. Connolly (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. Crisp with Mr. Bacharach.
 Mr. Cochran of Missouri with Mr. Niedringhaus.
 Mr. Byrns with Mr. Seger.
 Mr. Cullen with Mr. Dowell.
 Mr. Douglas of Arizona, with Mr. Reid of Illinois.
 Mr. Sweeney with Mr. Crowther.
 Mr. Gambrill with Mr. Magrady.
 Mr. O'Connor with Mr. Free.
 Mr. Briggs with Mrs. Rogers.
 Mr. Lindsay with Mr. Holaday.
 Mr. Patman with Mr. Doutrich.
 Mr. Granfield with Mr. Clancy.
 Mr. Oliver of New York with Mr. Kopp.
 Mr. Shannon with Mr. Perkins.
 Mr. Corning with Mr. Bohn.
 Mr. Summers of Texas with Mr. Kendall.
 Mr. Rudd with Mr. Hopkins.
 Mr. Garrett with Mr. Wolverton.

Mr. Gavagan with Mr. McLeod.
 Mr. Underwood with Mr. Pratt.
 Mr. Griffin with Mr. Rich.
 Mr. Vihson of Kentucky with Mr. Sullivan of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Hogg of West Virginia.
 Mr. Evans of Montana with Mr. Eaton of New Jersey.
 Mr. Romjue with Mr. Person.
 Mr. Carley with Mr. Crall.
 Mr. Hancock of North Carolina with Mr. Lehlbach.
 Mr. Black with Mr. Carter of California.
 Mr. Chapman with Mr. Britten.
 Mr. Boylan with Mr. Kinzer.
 Mr. Nelson of Missouri with Mr. Beers.
 Mr. Brunner with Mr. Temple.
 Mr. Igoe with Mr. Johnson of Illinois.
 Mr. Sullivan of New York with Mr. Kurtz.
 Mr. Harlan with Mr. Murphy.
 Mr. Kennedy with Mrs. Pratt.
 Mr. Celler with Mr. Hartley.
 Mr. Sirovich with Mr. Stokes.
 Mr. Palmisano with Mr. Seiberling.
 Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Brand of Ohio.
 Mr. Cary with Mr. Chase.
 Mr. Sabath with Mr. Mouser.
 Mr. Freeman with Mr. De Priest.
 Mr. Yates with Mr. Finley.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I have a general pair with the gentleman from Rhode Island, Mr. ALDRICH. If he were present he would vote "no." I voted "aye." I withdraw my vote and answer "present."

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. VINSON, is absent on account of illness. He desires me to say that if he were present he would vote "aye."

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. COLLIER, is absent on account of illness. He desires me to state that if he were present he would vote "aye."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New Hampshire, Mr. ROGERS, is unavoidably absent. If he were present, he would vote "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. WARREN, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

THE "LAME-DUCK" AMENDMENT

Mr. JEFFERS. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report on Senate Joint Resolution 14, proposing an amendment to the Constitution for printing under the rule.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS—EMERGENCY HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members of the House have five legislative days in which to extend their own remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat surprised at the opposition that has developed to this bill to create an emergency fund of \$120,000,000 to construct highways throughout the length and breadth of the land, with some twelve millions additional for road construction in our public parks and Indian reservations.

I can not say that I am especially surprised at the strenuous opposition of the distinguished Republican leader from Indiana [Mr. Wood], who for several years served as the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. We know he has consistently opposed many other worthy appropriations because, I assume, of the depleted Federal Treasury. But I must confess that I am somewhat surprised at the vociferous opposition of the distinguished gentleman from Chicago [Mr. CHINDELOM], who is not particularly known as such a consistent advocate of economy. In fact, it has only been a few days ago that the distinguished gentleman from Illinois stood on this floor and begged Congress to appropriate \$1,750,000 to finance a show that his friends and constituents are sponsoring in the great city of Chicago—a show that he, several months ago, induced Congress to recognize as the world's fair. As I recall, we were assured by the same gentleman that Congress would not be called upon to make an appropriation for his fair; but the camel got its neck under a tent and

Congress has been called upon to pay a lion's share of the bill. Only a few days ago the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, who now pleads with tears in his eyes for economy, was begging Congress to appropriate some million and three-quarters and actually induced this House to give his fair \$1,000,000. Now, the gentleman from the great city, along with other distinguished leaders from some of the other city districts, is vigorously opposing this bill for highway construction that means so much toward the relief of the unemployed throughout the entire country. I do not understand that brand of economy.

The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SIMMONS] spent considerable time discussing everything but the pending bill. The fact is, he gave us a political lecture criticizing the Democrats and forgot to state whether he was for or against this measure, but I assume that he is opposed to it because it happens to come from a committee the majority of which are Democrats and is being supported by almost the entire Democratic membership of this House. The gentleman from Nebraska, as I recall, joined the gentleman from Illinois and other Republican leaders in supporting legislation that was nothing more nor less than a dole to big business and then to-day gives Members of the House a free lecture on economy.

Frankly, I am at a loss to understand how our Republican friends, who so enthusiastically supported the so-called Reconstruction Finance Corporation to underwrite big business, big banks, and the railroads, have the temerity to oppose this bill that is not a drop in the bucket as compared with the two-billion Reconstruction Finance Corporation bill. I am amazed that gentlemen who worked and spoke so earnestly for a bill granting a moratorium of \$250,000,000 interest on foreign war debts, a bill that will mean the final cancellation of \$11,000,000,000 due America by foreign governments, could with good conscience oppose this bill to bring some measure of relief to the unemployed people of our own country who are in such great distress at this time.

There appear to be two general but conflicting ideas in Congress as to the proper method of relieving the economic situation, the returning of prosperity, and especially in relieving the millions of destitute and unemployed. One idea is the dole, the other is to inaugurate a real public-building and road program to permit our people to actually earn a respectable living. I do not hesitate to say that I much prefer the latter method. Give our people work and we will hear no real demand for a dole to feed the hungry. But our citizens demand and have a right to insist on an opportunity to earn a livelihood. The situation is serious, and Congress can not afford to ignore the pleas of the seven or eight millions of unemployed representing some twenty to thirty millions of people who must be fed and clothed.

Mr. Speaker, let me say in conclusion I agree that this Congress must economize. It must combine overlapping departments, slash appropriations, eliminate a lot of high-powered commissions, and cut salaries that may be unreasonably high. But I insist that is an idle gesture, inconsistent and false economy for gentlemen to oppose the pending measure that will not only put idle and destitute men to work but will prove a lasting benefit to every section of the country, and yet at the same time show such a magnanimous spirit to ungrateful foreign governments and give a straight-out dole to make good worthless and questionable bonds of international bankers.

The pending road bill should by all means be passed to-day.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, the pending bill proposes to loan to the States from the Federal Treasury the sum of \$120,000,000 for highway purposes. I am opposed to the proposition. Not one word has been uttered that, in my judgment, justifies such action.

The people of our country are struggling under enormous tax burdens. We should reduce and not increase them.

Last June 30 the expenses of the Government for the year were \$903,000,000 more than the revenues. By the

end of the present fiscal year they will be \$2,100,000,000 more than the income for the current year.

Gentlemen seem to forget that moneys expended mean that taxes must be paid. Whether the money is expended from the Federal Treasury or the State, it makes no difference. Taxes to meet expenditures must be paid by every farmer, by every business man, by every citizen.

This bill proposes a loan to the States of \$120,000,000. For what purpose? For road building and for the States to use in matching other Government money that the United States is appropriating for cooperative road work with the States.

To the extent that State authorities accept this money, to that extent they add the equivalent of a bond issue upon the people of the States in whatever amount they borrow.

In probably all State constitutions definite provisions may be found limiting the borrowing of money and the floating of bonds.

Bond limits are usually fixed. Yet here you are proposing a plan by which a few officers of a State acting alone may assume for their State a definite liability, a definite indebtedness that must be met some time by the people of the State in taxes. Legislatures are not required to act. Electors and voters are not consulted. Constitutional limitations are brushed aside and burdens are saddled upon the States.

Gentlemen, we are already carrying forward road programs that are tremendously burdensome. Most road building has been voted in some manner by those who will be called upon to pay. But here you are departing from the policy of local control or determination and you are proposing a new method of creating indebtedness that will come back to plague you in the years to come.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of this emergency measure to vote \$120,000,000 for immediate application to construction of highways in the United States.

It is estimated 85 per cent of the money finds its way directly or indirectly to labor; that about 1,000,000 of our 8,000,000 unemployed will be put to work thereby.

I like especially two features—one that the spending of the fund for employment will not be delayed, so it may be used for the need of Americans out of work at a time when they need it most, during the coming months.

Another feature is that this appropriation is treated as a sort of a loan, an advancement on money already planned to be appropriated to the States in the next 10 years, only in this instance this appropriation will not have to be matched by an equal appropriation from each State.

In a way, we are not going into a new debt to help unemployment. We are merely advancing money to be expended in the years 1932 and 1933, which has already been allocated to be appropriated several years later for Federal road building.

We will pay a greater tax now in this attempt to relieve unemployment. But it is a tax in any event planned to be incurred at a later date. That is, we are merely setting the calendar ahead, and will charge this fund off against the future appropriations as planned. American labor does not need or want a dole.

I do not see this as in any sense a dole. I call it a loan, to be paid back and in line with the loan whereby millions are advanced by Uncle Sam for our Reconstruction Finance Corporation to save our banks, secured and to be paid back into the United States Treasury some future day.

This is the first near direct aid act for the unemployed. In proportion to the number out of work and their needs in the next few months while the worst of this depression is on us, the amount of money appropriated is relatively small.

So many of our people can not understand how we can vote huge sums for direct aid to our financial institutions and no direct aid to the everyday citizen and his family out of work.

The passage of this measure will be at least a partial answer. I can see the urgent need of both; of aid to both the financial institutions, already aided and on their feet, and labor yet to be helped. I voted for and talked in sup-

port of our two bank-aid loans. There is equal reason I should take as vigorous and as active a stand for this legislation.

I am strongly for this bill. I trust the Senate and President will see it through to an early passage so some of our unemployed will be relieved without delay and the rest heartened in the thought that we have their interest, at heart, and, if need be, will go much further to aid them along similar lines.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Speaker, the bill before us is for the construction of Federal highways in 48 States. It appropriates \$120,000,000 for that purpose to be matched by a like amount by the several States. Whether highway aid by the Federal Government is wise or unwise, it is too late now to object on that ground when we know that thousands of miles of permanent highways in this country have been made possible only by Federal aid. In other words, the wealthier States have provided for general highway construction in all States, a result that could not have been reached in a score of years if left to the States alone to build. The bill allots a specific amount to each State based on the method employed so that Wisconsin receives \$2,992,438 from the Federal Government, or practically \$3,000,000. All States will eventually make full State contribution, by deductions from future Federal authorizations.

UNANIMOUS REPORT FOR A 90 PER CENT LABOR PROPOSAL

A unanimous report of a committee composed of 21 members, including 9 Republicans, accompanies the bill urged at this time of unemployment in order to help furnish jobs to men in need. No public works employs money for labor alone, but the Bureau of Public Works, Department of Agriculture, has made a survey and reports "at least 85 per cent and possibly more than 90 per cent of the money expended for a concrete pavement is ultimately paid out as wages and salaries." Briefly, it apportions paid labor at "15 per cent directly employed on construction"; about 12 per cent to men in quarries, sand pits, mills, and factories; about 14 per cent to men with railroads and for transportation; and the balance to men in mines, steel mills, and elsewhere producing road machinery.

Opposition to this measure is suggested because of an "unbalanced National Budget." Refunding on payment of the national debt in half of the proposed time would be unrelated to the annual Budget. Any project to meet the present abnormal business depression caused by world-wide conditions should be met by issuing Government credits for definite terms. That method is employed by individuals and by foreign moratoriums to aid other governments. Why not aid our own when a succeeding generation should properly help pay for war and other unusual public obligations?

WE HAVE HERETOFORE APPROPRIATED FOR AGRICULTURE AND BUSINESS

During this session Congress has appropriated, in round numbers, \$200,000,000 for loans to agriculture through Federal farm loan and other organizations. Also \$500,000,000 for banks, factories, and other businesses, where loans are to be secured by credits now rated as "frozen assets." A bank often represents thousands of depositors, who suffer if a solvent bank is closed because unable to raise cash to meet all demands. If a bank functions properly it is the local clearing house for business activities.

These and other measures Congress has passed to meet a present world-wide depression and prevent conditions from becoming worse in this country, with a confident belief they will help turn the tide. All were passed practically unanimously. Why not give unemployment aid to the States by this proposed loan? The total amount would barely build three battleships, soon to be obsolete and used for targets.

Our American Government is sound financially, but in this world depression we find an age of machinery and overproduction compared with consumption which now calls for credits. That has been covered by other bills passed this session in order to inspire public confidence and aid business, which employs labor, so that labor in turn can buy food and other products. Any advance of funds for road building is not a gift but made under existing law so that Federal aid

will furnish road building and help every industry contributing toward that end.

GOVERNMENT RESPONSIBILITY FOR WELFARE OF CITIZENS

Apart from secured loans, whether for seed, grain, agricultural loans, or to save more banks from closing, I believe the Federal and State Governments have a direct responsibility for the welfare of citizens and all others who are suffering from want of food and clothing.

With its invitation to individual initiative and offer of opportunity ours is the nearest approach to popular government of any in the world, but with changing conditions which limit opportunities we may well study conditions that permit individuals to accumulate a billion dollars, or many millions in numerous cases, while men and women looking for work are dependent on private charity.

If charity gave proportionately to ability, such relief might be defended; but selfishness and greed that accumulates fabulous wealth is not inclined to give proportionately or liberally to charity. Its training is all to the contrary. Our country in 1921 gave \$20,000,000 in foodstuffs to starving Russia. My committee then recommended the gift to the House, and in 1923 I traveled 600 miles down the Volga River famine district, hearing expressions of heartfelt gratitude from lips of those who were helped by the American Relief Association.

GENEROUS GIVING FOR OTHER PURPOSES

We give hundreds of millions of dollars in direct Government flood protection to people who insist on remaining in flood districts. In countless other ways Congress gives to drought areas, to unproductive waterway improvements, and to other sections specific relief.

No one will seek to discredit charities afforded in national emergencies that have come from the Red Cross, Near East relief, American relief, and other associations, but Congress also has extended a helping hand to Russian famine districts, to Austria, and China, and to hungry people in countries of warring Europe indiscriminately. Its aid and benevolences, more than its soldiers and sailors, have left for us lasting gratitude on the part of Europe and Asia. America has responded nobly to every cry for help from the distressed of every land, including our own.

As a joint partner in this humanitarian work, supplying an emergency Federal, State, and local aid supplementing temporary charity, I have offered a bill that amplifies benevolences by furnishing in great emergencies constructive labor with just compensation for a jobless army.

PROVISIONS OF BILL BRIEFLY SUGGESTED

My bill (H. R. 4552) for meeting emergency unemployment situations provides for a permanent Federal commission of three Cabinet officers, acting ex officio with a skeleton organization, excepting in cases of emergency, when the Federal Government is requested to aid local unemployment.

It provides, whenever petition is received from any State for contribution to meet emergency local unemployment, with notice that the State has made like provision for an unemployment agency, that the Federal commission will consider applications from any municipal corporation in that State for contribution toward the construction of specified local municipal improvements. The Federal commission may, after investigation, contribute not to exceed 20 per cent of the cost of the local improvement, to be matched by 20 per cent contributed by the State government, and the balance of 60 per cent is to be borne by the municipality for which the improvement is to be constructed.

Provisions for safeguarding the money so contributed by the commission, character of the local improvement to be approved, control and manner of payment of money, and other requirements are briefly set forth in the bill.

The Federal Government by contributing \$100,000,000 in any great unemployment emergency would thus employ five times that amount in the construction of municipal improvements; the State, through its cooperation and equal contribution, would assume supervision of construction and thus avoid what might be undue demands by any one locality.

Restriction in the amount paid by the Federal Government of \$1,000,000 to any municipality and of \$5,000,000 in any one State from the \$100,000,000 appropriation would thus provide five times the Federal contribution and safeguard any attempt to absorb the appropriation by one or more States. This aid would be in force only during the declared emergency by the commission. Not to exceed \$25,000 shall be expended annually for commission investigations, excepting during the period of a declared emergency. These provisions are tentatively offered subject to amendment.

The bill answers the proposition that a man or woman asking for work should not be compelled to depend on public charity or beg for aid when out of a job. Wives, children, and other dependents must beg for that aid to-day, and humiliation in so doing is not understood by those blessed with a job or competence. Work helps an applicant maintain self-respect that is lost when forced to beg for aid.

Workmen's insurance, unemployment insurance, and other aid is all preferable to begging for charity, but I submit these do not meet the requirements of those asking for work instead of charity.

THE ENGLISH DOLE AND EMERGENCY AID DISTINGUISHED

From the lips of English laborers, when in that country, I learned their belief that the "dole" encourages idleness and dishonesty by substituting financial support for work. Instead of building a self-dependent manhood and womanhood for citizenship, the dole was declared to encourage slothfulness, hypocrisy, and dishonesty. However worthy its purpose, I learned that was the result. This bill is called into service during an unexpected emergency, which the commission determines to exist.

Neither a billionaire nor a millionaire who has acquired his wealth under our beneficent laws needs vast wealth for his selfish use during such emergency unemployment. When our forefathers wrote that all men have inalienable rights of life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness, they intended to say that every man, not the few, had full protection under our law to those rights, and taxation nearer the English-system rates is justified during times of emergency.

In this day of financial extremes, where men of great wealth satisfy their consciences by dribbling small charities to keep other equally good Americans from starving, we may well ask, have we assured to those in need rights of existence promised by our forefathers when establishing this Government?

I have no envy for any man possessing great wealth. He misses much in life for the selfish enjoyment he gets in accumulating money. To cite an extreme case, the miser gets happiness out of his habits and his sacrifices for wealth, but few people envy him that joy. We are dealing with human rights when that wealth is permitted to accumulate and be protected, to the exclusion of rights to work and live by millions when not blessed with food or shelter.

MEN WHO ASKED FOR JOBS

It is generally understood that Secretary of the Treasury Mellon, by threats of resignation and fears of ultimate national financial confusion, persuaded Presidents Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover to oppose and veto proposed veteran-compensation legislation. Its effect on the subject in hand is disclosed by the following extract from committee hearings quoted in a speech in the House on February 16, 1931:

Appeals for relief of unemployment by veterans and tales of need do not go to Mr. Mellon, where they would be unanswered, but to General Hines.

I quote from the committee hearings of January 31, 1931:

"General HINES. I estimate between 200,000 and 300,000 ex-service men are out of employment. . . ."

"Mr. FREAR. You have previously stated that not over 50 per cent if given the option would release their certificates, so that 50 per cent will not be forced; is that right?"

"General HINES. That is correct."

"Mr. FREAR. The proportion that will be forced is simply those out of work, in distress, with their families in need. Now, what provisions are we to make to care for those people other than the bills which are now before us?"

"General HINES. I indicated, Congressman, I felt we should make an effort to get them into employment. . . . The Department of Labor, with the cooperation of the Veterans' Administration and the service organizations, indicate the result of our combined efforts. . . . that from May until December of 35,974 veterans they were able to place in employment 13,253. An additional 17,439 have been referred to employers but to date it had not resulted in getting a job."

"Mr. FREAR. On the basis of those figures 22,000 of the 35,000 are still out of employment?"

"General HINES. Yes."

"Mr. FREAR. Now, what proportion of the total number would you say are in this third group that are in distress or in need?"

"General HINES. I think I limited it to two or three hundred thousand."

"Mr. FREAR. These combined efforts, as you have stated, have provided 13,000 with employment out of two or three hundred thousand. What are we to do for the balance of those two or three hundred thousand?"

"General HINES. It is our duty to continue our special effort to get the veteran employment. . . ."

"Mr. FREAR. But if we have only secured 13,000 positions out of two or three hundred thousands we have not made much progress. . . ."

"Of course, they are put in competition with the great number out of employment who are not ex-service men. That is one reason why 13,000, the number provided for, is so limited, is it not?"

"General HINES. Yes."

That relief bill was vetoed, with a dismal prospect of crowding soup houses with American boys we had drafted and sent to war, often hungry, looking for food in places already filled by several million other Americans looking for jobs. Congress, irrespective of politics, voted not to throw out the pleas of men who fought in France to help save Mellon's millions from serious loss. In so doing, to a mild degree, Congress reflected the immortal spirit of the Father of our County, whose anniversary we celebrate, when again it overruled a presidential veto.

HOW THESE MEN GOT JOBS

Present conditions are disclosed when the press recently reported that a call in one city for 250 men to dig ditches for sewers caused ten times that number to stand in line during the night, including many white-collared men, all looking for jobs to dig dirt at nominal wages. A small riot was precipitated by the excess of labor asking for that work.

A Federal unemployment commission to deal constructively with the problem might well follow the plan of Federal highway aid. That commission should be authorized in emergency to extend possibly not to exceed 20 per cent of the cost of new local, municipal improvements, providing the State in which the municipality is located contributed a like amount of State money.

This would leave 60 per cent of the actual cost of the improvement to be borne by the municipality. Such improvements, when an emergency was declared to exist, would extend from ordinary permanent municipal improvements to projects for housing and otherwise caring for the welfare of its people. The work to be performed under joint supervision after the project, including wages and amount of joint contribution, had been determined and agreed to.

Federal aid would be extended only in cases of unemployment emergency, to be determined by the administrative board acting under definite provisions of law, to avoid extravagance or unauthorized expenditures. Such Federal aid would be based upon cooperation by the State and local municipal unit. Details can be provided for safeguarding the Federal Government and a plan could be developed to meet the necessities of a situation that everyone concedes demands vigorous treatment.

FIVE TIMES THE FEDERAL AID WOULD BE EXPENDED

By payment of \$1,000,000,000 toward unemployment in one year, a proper investment, the Federal Government could secure a contribution of four times that amount to be added from the States and municipalities, or a total of \$5,000,000,000. Probably one-tenth of \$5,000,000,000 that could thus be raised for any emergency would be sufficient to meet ordinary demands, but work should be given to those who ask for it, where possible to furnish.

A contribution of \$100,000,000 from the Federal Government, with a like sum from the State and three times that amount from the municipality, would furnish employment

for 2,500,000 people for several months at modest compensation, and double that Federal contribution would provide 5,000,000 unemployed with work on useful improvements throughout the average period of depression. Compared with appeals to charities, this would be a far better method of relief than to provide simple gratuities which would not approach those amounts during the same period nor be equitably contributed by those best able to pay.

The blessings of individualism have long been held up to the world, but when men and women ask for work instead of charity it is time for us to give attention to our own public methods that excite criticism from abroad.

The suggestion is here proffered of a constructive plan that may be further developed, with a protest against forcing self-respecting people to line up with down and outers, by pleading for charity, when work and not charity is asked. Our country can and should face the problem squarely, by making provision for the present and for the future emergencies that are sure to come.

WHERE REAL TAXES ARE PAID TO BALANCE THE BUDGET

To get a picture of the moderate tax paid by Americans, compared to that paid by English cousins, a tax proposal by Snowden in England reached 5 shillings (or 25 per cent) on the pound as the basic income tax. Ten per cent increase in the surtax on higher incomes is also an additional method of distributing wealth in conservative England.

Sixteen cents per pound on smoking tobacco, 16 cents tax a gallon on gasoline, and similar heavy English taxes are there imposed. A small fraction of that tax rate would provide work for all America's unemployed.

It is sometimes comforting to know that misery has company, and in these days of business depression when all the world is affected, the situation does not look so bad when we realize that, after all, ours is the best country in many ways, and it is only a matter of slightly better distribution of wealth by taxation that is asked in time of need, and contribution from those best able to pay in order to provide work for those who ask for jobs and not for charity.

This bill is to advance funds to States to be deducted from future allotments in order to provide work on Federal highways. If we can properly advance funds to banks through Federal agencies, and all Members of Congress unanimously agreed to do that in order to save banks from closing with serious injury to communities, it is certain we can afford advances to States when the purpose is to furnish jobs directly or indirectly, to those asking for work.

Mr. HALL of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, after having voted for legislation designed to help the bankers and the railroad men, I am delighted to cast my ballot for the Almon emergency road construction measure. It will not only afford a considerable degree of unemployment relief in my own State but boost employment in every State in the Union.

Moreover, it is in fact the first single measure hitherto passed by either House of Congress which provides jobs for workingmen. Nor is the \$120,000,000 appropriation authorized a Federal donation or "dole" to the several States. It is merely a temporary loan to be recaptured from future Federal-aid authorizations in 10 annual installments.

There is neither guesswork nor hearsay concerning the measure of unemployment relief to be afforded. Eighty million dollars appropriated last by a similar act provided employment for an average of 300,000 men a month, and besides approximately twice that number were employed in the manufacture and transportation of road-building materials.

Consequently, the proposed loan would furnish work, directly and indirectly, for about a million men. What is more, it would permit many States to match Federal-aid funds already appropriated for that purpose.

Unquestionably putting people to work is the best way to route the depression.

Of the one hundred and twenty millions authorized by the Almon bill, \$2,160,628 would be allotted to Mississippi, and

that, matched by a like amount of Federal-aid money, would make available \$4,321,356 for road construction in my State. And there are ample Federal-aid funds available for matching the amount allocated to Mississippi.

All the States have to their credit about \$109,000,000 of Federal-aid highway funds, and if they are not matched by the respective States within two years the money will lapse and revert back to the Treasury. Of the above amount, more than \$5,000,000 is accredited to Mississippi, and, naturally, I want the people of my State to be enabled to match that fund and use it in extending our highway system.

Fortunately, Mississippi would fare considerably better than some of the other States which would pay in more in the shape of Federal taxes than their pro rata share of the fund would amount to. To offset the \$2,160,628 obtainable under the Almon bill, Mississippi would pay out only \$72,000 in Federal revenue.

According to the Bureau of Public Roads, at least 85 per cent of the money expended on concrete roads, or high-type construction highways, is ultimately paid out in wages and salaries. Or, stated another way, \$40 out of every \$100 goes for transportation, \$14 for base materials, \$24 for cement, \$16 for road-building machinery, and the rest for labor engaged directly on the construction jobs. In consequence upward of one-half million would be paid out in Mississippi to the men who actually would build the roads. As a great deal of the materials would be manufactured and transported within the State, the expenditure of this emergency road-construction fund would accelerate business all along the line.

Mississippi, I am glad to say, is constructing her highways on the pay-as-you-go system. Already wonderful progress has been made, and besides road building is being pushed as rapidly as possible. Hence, this emergency loan would not only provide employment for a great number of people in my State and district but would go a long ways toward ultimate completion of our highway system.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, this bill authorizes a supplemental appropriation of \$120,000,000 for emergency highway construction to be apportioned among the several States according to existing methods, and \$12,500,000 for roads in national parks, national forests, and Indian reservations. The \$120,000,000 item is to be matched dollar for dollar by the States. The amount Vermont will receive, and be expected to match, is \$600,000. I voted against the bill because, at this time, it will be very difficult for the Government to obtain the \$132,500,000.

The Nation is facing a crisis as dangerous to its life as any during its history. Our accumulating deficit is assuming alarming proportions. The Government is running behind at the rate of more than \$6,000,000 per day. The Ways and Means Committee is searching every available source for increased revenue. The Committee on Appropriations is working night and day to cut expenditures in order to balance the budget. All that has been accomplished by hard work and careful planning is swept away by this authorization.

The bill proposes not only to drain the Federal Treasury to the amount of \$132,500,000 but it encourages an additional burden of \$600,000 on the already overtaxed people of my State.

It is said that this bill will relieve unemployment, but a study of it reveals that the amounts will not be allocated in proportions according to necessities to the States with the dense populations, where the unemployment situations are acute. It will go to States of the wide, open spaces, where unemployment burdens are much easier. In other words, the amount appropriated will be drawn from the States that contribute the most in taxes and where the effects of the depression are acute and will be distributed where it is not needed. Vermont, with a population of 360,000, will be allocated \$600,000, while Nevada, with a population of 91,058, will receive \$1,578,025.

The claim that it will give employment to a million people can not be substantiated. The best authentic estimates available indicate that the work to be done will not employ

75,000 throughout the whole Nation. The number of men who will be given employment in my State will not exceed 300, not more than the number employed in a fair-sized manufacturing plant.

The home people are demanding that we reduce and not increase Government expenses. They insist that we cut taxes down to the limit necessary to run the Nation. They will hold us responsible for failure to do so. We will be judged by actual performance. What progress are we making by reducing here and there and then authorizing an appropriation of an amount greater than has been saved? The people will not be deceived by the arguments advanced in favor of this measure.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on this bill and include therein two short letters from the Wisconsin Highway Commission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Reserving the right to object, is it in favor of the bill or against it?

Mr. SCHAFFER. In favor, and giving the Federal Government a little credit for relieving unemployment.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I shall not object.

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, under the permission given me by the House to extend my remarks on February 27, 1932, I incorporate in the RECORD letters which I received from the Wisconsin Highway Commission under date of December 15 and December 17, 1931, which indicate that one commission of the Wisconsin State government, now in control of the La Follette faction of the Republican Party, gives the national administration, under the control of the Republican Party, some credit for assisting to relieve unemployment in our State.

The letters are as follows:

WISCONSIN HIGHWAY COMMISSION,
Madison, Wis., December 15, 1931.

Hon. JOHN C. SCHAFFER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SCHAFFER: The unemployment situation in this State and the necessity of completing certain unimproved portions of our Federal-aid highway system during the 1932 construction program prompts me, as the chairman of the State highway commission, to bring to your attention the urgency of additional Federal legislation designed to provide the financial relief necessary.

About a year ago Congress made \$80,000,000 available as special Federal aid for highway construction (H. R. 14804; Public, 550, 71st Cong.). This was merely an advance of Federal aid already appropriated, which is to be repaid through future allotments of Federal aid over a period of five years. The amount that thus became available to this State was approximately \$1,900,000, and this advance, in addition to the amounts that were available from other sources, made it possible for our State to carry out one of the best construction programs that we have ever had. We are sure that this advance contributed materially to the relief of unemployment, and we also are sure that there was a material improvement in our State trunk highway system as a result of it.

You are probably aware that our 1931 legislature enacted important highway legislation in chapter 22, Laws of 1931. This, however, was primarily a tax-relief measure in that it shifted the cost of highway improvements from general property to the motor-vehicle license fees and gasoline taxes. The amount of revenues made available for highway improvement was not increased. On the contrary, an important falling off in motor-vehicle registrations and a decrease in gasoline-tax collections over what was anticipated leaves the commission in very straitened circumstances in so far as its 1932 program is concerned.

This situation is bad in two ways: In the first place, a decrease in our highway-construction program means a cutting down in the class of public work which offers the greatest opportunity for unemployment relief; and, in the second place, it makes it impossible for the commission to carry out some highway improvements which it had projected in 1932 and whose completion will be of the very greatest benefit to the traveling public in this State. As you are doubtless aware, our Wisconsin system of highway building has been criticized because of an alleged lack of completed through highways. We have, however, reached the stage in our highway development where the construction of a relatively limited mileage will serve to close certain unimproved gaps and thus provide the through routes which are quite necessary and whose lack has caused much adverse criticism.

You are doubtless more familiar with what is practical than we can possibly be, but we venture the following suggestions. The best thing for us would be an outright appropriation by Congress for the construction of the Federal-aid system in this

and the other States. If this is not practical, a repetition of the legislation of a year ago, when \$80,000,000 was advanced from future appropriations, would be helpful and would enable us to carry out a program next year which would compare favorably with the 1931 program both in the way of providing employment and in the way of improvement of our State trunk highways. I think, in fact, our showing in the way of improvement would be even better than in 1931 due to the tremendous effect of the completion of a number of through routes.

I am thoroughly convinced of the necessity of the provision of relief by the Federal Government as well as by the State and know that we can expend any Federal appropriations that may be made available to this State in such a way as to provide relief for unemployment and to give the public full value for every cent expended. I sincerely hope that you also will be impressed with the distribution of such a program as I have here advocated.

I am sending identical letters on this subject to all of our representatives in Congress. Thanking you for your consideration, I am,

Very truly yours,

WISCONSIN HIGHWAY COMMISSION,
By THOS. J. PATTISON, Chairman.

WISCONSIN HIGHWAY COMMISSION,
Madison, Wis., December 17, 1931.

Hon. JOHN C. SCHAFFER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SCHAFFER: The purpose of this letter is to urge your cooperation for repeating the special allotment of Federal aid in highway construction in 1932 as was done in 1931 by H. R. 14804, Public, No. 550, Seventy-first Congress. Wisconsin received a substantial portion of the \$80,000,000 special Federal fund and needs it very badly the coming year.

As you know, the 2-cent increase in the gas tax is producing added revenue in the amount of \$8,475,000, but every dollar of this is returned to the taxpayer in relief from real and personal property tax. In fact, the provisions of the statute take not only every dollar of the new revenue produced but an additional \$650,000 for allotments producing tax relief.

The consequence has been that there is a great deal of disappointment in the limited construction undertaken the past year and there will be similar disappointment the coming year, due to the fact that nine out of ten taxpayers have the mistaken idea that the increased revenue was intended to produce new construction rather than tax relief.

The policy of the administration to confine public works for the relief of unemployment exclusively to projects of permanent value, such as would be undertaken in the future under normal conditions, is, in my judgment, based on sound public policy.

My short tenure on the highway commission has impressed me with the care with which every item is checked and rechecked and the rigid economy that is practiced in every construction and maintenance operation. Nor have I ever heard even a whispered suggestion of graft in the operation of the department.

It would seem sound public policy to spend money on projects that are supervised and checked with scrupulous care by competent engineers.

I should appreciate a line as to the probability of legislation duplicating H. R. 14804 passing Congress.

Very truly yours,

WISCONSIN HIGHWAY COMMISSION,
JOHN C. SCHMIDTMANN, Vice Chairman.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent the following leaves of absence were granted:

To Mr. GAMBRILL, for to-day, on account of death in family of his uncle, James H. Gambrill, at Frederick, Md., at the ripe old age of 102 years;

To Mr. FIESINGER, from February 29 to March 4, on account of important business.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 268. An act to excuse certain persons from residence upon homestead lands during 1929, 1930, and 1931 in the drought-stricken areas; and

H. J. Res. 292. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to aid in the establishment of agricultural credit corporations, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, February 29, 1932, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. RAINEY submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Monday, February 29, 1932, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS. SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 8

(10 a. m.)

To provide that first-class postmasters shall not continue in office more than one year after the expiration of their terms of office, if not reappointed (H. R. 6012).

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

(9.30 a. m.)

Dramatists.

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

Post-graduate school of the United States Naval Academy.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

(10 a. m.)

To establish uniform requirements affecting Government contracts (H. R. 255).

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

456. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations pertaining to the legislative establishment, Library of Congress, for the fiscal year 1933, in the sum of \$1,880; also two proposed provisions pertaining to existing appropriations for the index to Federal statutes and for printing and binding for the Library of Congress (H. Doc. No. 260); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

457. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1932, in the amount of \$135,000, for the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs (H. Doc. No. 261); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. DRANE: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 809. A bill for the relief of Roy W. Farrell; without amendment (Rept. No. 630). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HANCOCK: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 2254. A bill for the relief of Victor Oscar Gokey; with amendment (Rept. No. 631). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DRANE: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 3644. A bill for the relief of Lewis A. McDermott, deceased; with amendment (Rept. No. 632). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2066) for the relief of Bertha Hymes Sternfeld, and the same was referred to the Committee on Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HARLAN: A bill (H. R. 9877) to repeal obsolete sections of the Revised Statutes omitted from the United States; to the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

By Mr. MAY: A bill (H. R. 9878) to authorize the leasing of the Muscle Shoals property, upon certain terms and conditions, to provide for the national defense and for the

regulation of interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARDEN: A bill (H. R. 9879) to amend the act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes," approved May 22, 1920, and acts in amendment thereof, approved July 3, 1926, as amended; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: A bill (H. R. 9880) adopting and authorizing the improvement of Stikine River, Alaska; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9881) adopting and authorizing the improvement of Dry Pass, Alaska; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9882) adopting and authorizing the improvement of Wrangell Harbor, Alaska; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9883) adopting and authorizing the improvement of Wrangell Narrows, Alaska; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9884) adopting and authorizing the improvement of Kodiak Harbor, Alaska; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 9885) to stabilize the values of the imports from countries changing their monetary standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 9886) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. RAMSPECK: A bill (H. R. 9887) to consolidate and coordinate certain governmental activities affecting the civil service of the United States; to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. McMILLAN: A bill (H. R. 9888) to amend section 117 of the revenue act of 1928; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: A bill (H. R. 9889) to validate chapter 89 of the Session Laws of Alaska for the year 1931, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. THATCHER: A bill (H. R. 9890) to authorize an appropriation for the construction and equipment of a hospital at Fort Knox, Ky.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KELLER: A bill (H. R. 9891) to provide for the establishment of a system of pensions for railroad and transportation employees and for a railroad pension board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LUCE: A bill (H. R. 9892) to provide that the United States extend to foreign governments invitations to participate in the International Congress of Architects, to be held in the United States during the calendar year 1933, and to authorize an appropriation to assist in meeting the expenses of the session; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHAFER: A bill (H. R. 9893) to prohibit the tapping of telephone and telegraph lines, and prohibiting the use of information obtained by such illegal tapping to be used as evidence in the courts of the United States in civil suits and criminal prosecutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOWMAN: A bill (H. R. 9894) for the relief of Florence Glass; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CROWTHER: A bill (H. R. 9895) granting an increase of pension to Emil Voris; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOOPER: A bill (H. R. 9896) for the relief of Eugene D. Broas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HANCOCK of New York: A bill (H. R. 9897) for the relief of Benjamin Solari; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KARCH: A bill (H. R. 9898) for the relief of Jerome Scallione; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9899) for the relief of Oscar John Neigenfind; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9900) for the relief of George A. Hearth; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEAVITT: A bill (H. R. 9901) granting a pension to Isaac Markum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PARKER of New York: A bill (H. R. 9902) granting an increase of pension to Julia E. Willard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCHAFER: A bill (H. R. 9903) for the relief of George Turkovich; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHREVE: A bill (H. R. 9904) granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Adsit; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIMMONS: A bill (H. R. 9905) granting an increase of pension to Marilla Flynn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9906) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Morse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWANK: A bill (H. R. 9907) for the relief of S. A. Rourke; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SWICK: A bill (H. R. 9908) granting an increase of pension to Laura L. McCready; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 9909) for the relief of Carrie P. Shippey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TABER: A bill (H. R. 9910) granting a pension to Emily B. Metcalf; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THATCHER: A bill (H. R. 9911) granting a pension to Tennessee Cantwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEAVER: A bill (H. R. 9912) for the relief of Mack Corn; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9913) for the relief of Ernest Elmore Hall; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9914) for the relief of Ben F. Draper; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WOODRUM: A bill (H. R. 9915) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, adjudicate, and enter judgment on the claim of William W. McElrath against the United States for compensation for the use or manufacture of an invention of William W. McElrath covered by reissue letters patent issued by the Patent Office of the United States on the 19th day of February, 1924; to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2962. By Mr. AUF DER HEIDE: Memorial of board of commissioners of the city of Trenton, N. J., opposing House bill 77, authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Delaware River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

2963. By Mr. BARBOUR: Petition of residents of the seventh congressional district of California, urging enforcement of the prohibition law and opposing the resubmission of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2964. By Mr. BOILEAU: Petition of the Milwaukee Federation of Special Delivery Messengers, Milwaukee, Wis., urging that special-delivery messengers in the postal department be placed under civil-service status; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2965. By Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa: Petition of the parent-teacher association, representing 500 people, of Monona County, Iowa, opposing the resubmission of the eighteenth

amendment to be ratified by State conventions or by State legislatures, and favoring adequate appropriations for law enforcement and for education in law observance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2966. Also, petition of 18 voters of Sac County, Iowa, both service and nonservice men, favoring the passage of House bill 1, which provides for the payment of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2967. By Mr. CLAGUE: Resolution adopted by the Fairmont Civic and Commerce Association, Fairmont, Minn., demanding that the Federal Farm Board be required to ship from its stores enough hoarded grain to the drought-stricken areas of North and South Dakota and western Minnesota to provide the necessary feed to carry the endangered livestock to spring pasturage; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2968. Also, resolution of John Watson Post, No. 257, American Legion, Springfield, Minn., urging the immediate cash payment of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2969. Also, petition of Ralph Lamb Post, No. 275, American Legion, Seaforth, Minn., favoring the immediate cash payment of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2970. By Mr. CLARKE of New York: Petition of Mrs. F. C. Potter and 22 members of the Franklin Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Franklin, N. Y., protesting against repeal, resubmission, or modification of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2971. Also, petition of 240 members of the Sidney Grange, protesting against repeal, resubmission, or modification of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2972. By Mr. CROWTHER: Petition of Group 614 of the Polish National Alliance of the United States, located in Amsterdam, N. Y., requesting enactment of House Joint Resolution 144; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2973. By Mr. CULKIN: Petition of Nacey Oil Co. and E. F. Welden, both of the city of Oswego, N. Y., protesting against a Federal tax on gasoline; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2974. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of Branch No. 2, Fleet Reserve Association, Brooklyn, N. Y., strongly opposing House bill 4892, the Williamson bill, and House bill 7012, the Byrns bill, urging the support of House bill 8230, a bill designed to raise the Navy to the pinnacle it rightly deserves, and opposing House bill 409 and recommending that it be not enacted; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

2975. Also, petition of Local No. 403, National Federation of Federal Employees, indorsing a favorable report of House bill 7327 by the Ways and Means Committee and urging the committee to recommend its passage by the House; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2976. By Mr. DALLINGER: Petition of Elizabeth S. Gardner and other members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Arlington, Mass., protesting against the repeal, resubmission, or modification of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2977. By Mr. DELANEY: Petition of the Fleet Reserve Association, Branch No. 2, urging the passage of the Vinson bill; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

2978. Also, petition of the Fleet Reserve Association, Branch No. 2, opposing the Williamson bill, H. R. 4892, and the Byrns bill, H. R. 7012; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2979. Also, petition of the Fleet Reserve Association, Branch No. 2, opposing House bill 409 to provide for payment of discharge gratuity to men after 16 years' service in the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

2980. By Mr. DOMINICK: Petition of the American Legion of Pickens County, S. C., urging passage of House bill 1; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2981. By Mr. EVANS of Montana: Resolution of Maud Neeley and others, of Missoula, Mont., urging Congress to submit immediately to the States for ratification the follow-

ing amendment to the Constitution: "Men and women shall have equal rights throughout the United States and every place subject to its jurisdiction"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2982. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition of First Ward Democratic Club of the City of Yonkers, located at 270 Hawthorne Avenue, Yonkers, N. Y., urging a revision of the sugar tariff in order that both sugar refineries located in the city of Yonkers may again be reopened for the manufacture of sugar, thereby giving employment to 2,000 citizens of Yonkers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2983. By Mr. GARBER: Petition of citizens of Oklahoma, protesting against the resubmission of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2984. Also, petition of citizens of Oklahoma, protesting against unnecessary expenditure of money; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2985. Also, petition of citizens of Oklahoma, protesting against the Norris anti-injunction bill and the LaGuardia bill, H. R. 5315; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2986. Also, petition of citizens of Oklahoma, urging the passage of House bill 7797 and Senate bills 1197 and 2487; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2987. By Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH: Petition of the Greensboro (Md.) Woman's Christian Temperance Union, supporting the maintenance of the prohibition law and its enforcement, and against any measure looking toward its modification, resubmission, or repeal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2988. By Mr. HAINES: Resolution adopted by the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Red Lion, Pa., representing 225 people, and signed by Mrs. Sterling Grim, as secretary, opposing resubmission of the eighteenth amendment to be ratified by State conventions or by State legislatures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2989. By Mr. JAMES: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Marquette, Mich.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2990. Also, petition of Mike Olejniczak, president, Anton Zielinski, secretary, and Mike Libertoski, treasurer, of Group No. 1445, of the Polish National Alliance of the United States of North America, Wakefield, Mich.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2991. Also, petition of Stanley Setlock, president, Mike Setlock, secretary, and John Baranski, treasurer, of the Polish National Alliance of the United States of North America, Vulcan, Mich.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2992. Also, petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Crystal Falls, Mich.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2993. By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: Petition of Rice M. Tilley, attorney at law, Fort Worth, Tex., favoring Federal regulation of trucks engaged in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2994. By Mr. KELLER: Petition of Group No. 1807, of the Polish National Alliance of the United States of North America, of West Frankfort, Ill., urging the enactment of House Joint Resolution 144, directing the President of the United States to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's memorial day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2995. Also, petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Carbondale, Ill., opposing resubmission of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2996. By Mr. LANKFORD of Virginia: Petition of Norfolk County chapter of the Polish National Alliance, Group No. 2518, memorializing Congress to proclaim October 11 as General Pulaski's memorial day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2997. Also, petition of the Franklin (Va.) chapter of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, opposing the resubmission of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2998. Also, petition of the State post authority of Virginia, opposing the 4-party plan for the consolidation of

railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2999. By Mr. LEA: Petition of 1,247 men actively engaged in business in Santa Rosa, Petaluma, Sebastopol, Healdsburg, Sonoma, Cloverdale, Geyserville, Forestville, and Windsor, all in Sonoma County, Calif., protesting against the continuation of the provision of the Volstead Act prohibiting the manufacture of beer and urging the modification of the Volstead Act in that respect; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3000. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of the Merchants Association of New York, opposing the passage of House bill 7524, to liquidate and refinance agricultural indebtedness; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3001. Also, petition of Fleet Reserve Association, No. 2, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the Vinson bill, H. R. 8230; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

3002. Also, petition of Fleet Reserve Association, No. 2, Brooklyn, N. Y., opposing the passage of House bill 409; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

3003. Also, petition of Medical Society of New York, opposing the passage of Jones-Bankhead bill 572; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3004. Also, petition of Fleet Reserve Association, No. 2, Brooklyn, N. Y., opposing the passage of House bills 4892 and 7012; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

3005. By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of Group No. 441 of the Polish National Alliance of Terryville, Conn., asking that on the 11th day of October of each year a proclamation be issued by the President for observation of the day as General Pulaski memorial day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3006. By Mr. MILLARD: Petition of members of the Court Fidelis, No. 91, of the Catholic Daughters of America, at New Rochelle, N. Y., protesting against the enactment of House bills 4757 and 4739; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3007. Also, petition signed by Mrs. Edward G. McWilliams and other citizens of Tarrytown and Ossining, N. J., protesting against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3008. By Mr. PARKER of Georgia: Petition of J. B. Lee, C. Lee, and 26 other citizens of Screven County, Ga., urging that the Federal Farm Board be maintained and strengthened instead of curtailing its activities or abolishing it; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3009. By Mr. PRATT: Petition of H. G. Rothe, B. Pieringer, Mrs. E. Schnare, and 23 other members of Adolph Von Steinwehr, No. 624, the Steuben Society of America, of Coxsackie, Greene County, N. Y., praying for repeal of the eighteenth amendment, modification meanwhile of the Volstead Act to permit the manufacture of light wines and 4 per cent beer, and legislation to return to the States the power to regulate the manufacture and dispensing of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3010. By Mr. RAINEY: Petition of L. W. Beeler and 23 other citizens of Chicago, Ill., with reference to lost or destroyed currency; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3011. By Mr. RAMSEYER: Petition of voters and service men of the sixth congressional district of Iowa, asking payment of the adjusted-service certificates in full at this time and providing for the issuance of Government money direct and without making loans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3012. By Mr. REED of New York: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Andover, N. Y., protesting against the repeal, resubmission, or modification of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3013. Also, petition of Rev. Perry F. Haines, Methodist Episcopal Church, Little Valley, N. Y., protesting against the repeal, resubmission, or modification of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3014. Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Little Valley, N. Y., protesting against the repeal, resubmission, or modification of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3015. Also, petition of 250 residents of Olean, N. Y., protesting against the repeal, resubmission, or modification of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3016. Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Machias, N. Y., protesting against the repeal, resubmission, or modification of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3017. Also, petition of the Twentieth Century Club, of Almond, N. Y., protesting against the repeal, resubmission, or modification of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3018. Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Cherry Creek, N. Y., protesting against the repeal, resubmission, or modification of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3019. Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Cuba, N. Y., protesting against the repeal, resubmission, or modification of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3020. Also, petition of Edwin Bell Bible Class of Buffalo Street Methodist Episcopal Church, Jamestown, N. Y., protesting against the repeal, resubmission, or modification of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3021. Also, petition of Almond Grange, No. 1102, Almond, N. Y., protesting against the repeal, resubmission, or modification of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3022. Also, petition of Wesleyan Methodist Church, Fillmore, N. Y., protesting against the repeal, resubmission, or modification of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3023. Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Almond, N. Y., protesting against the repeal, resubmission, or modification of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3024. Also, petition of 30 residents of Jamestown, N. Y., protesting against the repeal, resubmission, or modification of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3025. Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Westfield, N. Y., protesting against the repeal, resubmission, or modification of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3026. Also, petition of 25 residents of Belmont, N. Y., protesting against the repeal, resubmission, or modification of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3027. Also, petition of employees of Pearl City Plywood Co. (Inc.) and 56 manufacturers of Jamestown, N. Y., urging reduction of Federal appropriations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3028. By Mr. REID of Illinois: Resolution passed by the mayor and city commissioners of the city of Joliet, Ill., on February 23, 1932, urging the passage of House bill 1, which provides for the cash payment of adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3029. By Mr. RUDD: Petition of Fleet Reserve Association, Branch No. 2, of Brooklyn, N. Y., opposing the passage of House bill 409; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

3030. Also, petition of Fleet Reserve Association, No. 2, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 8230, the Vinson bill; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

3031. Also, petition of Fleet Reserve Association, No. 2, of Brooklyn, N. Y., opposing House bills 4892 and 7012; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

3032. Also, petition of Medical Society of the State of New York, opposing the Jones-Bankhead bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3033. Also, petition of New York Athletic Club, New York City, opposing the proposed tax of 10 per cent on club membership; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3034. Also, petition of the Merchants Association of New York, opposing the passage of the Sinclair bill (H. R. 7524) to liquidate and refinance agricultural indebtedness; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3035. By Mr. SELVIG: Petition of American Legion members, of Breckenridge, Minn., favoring immediate enactment of House bill 1; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3036. Also, petition of Hazel Swanson and 17 other residents of Detroit Lakes, Minn., protesting against the enactment of House bill 8092, for compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3037. Also, petition of the Brown Sheet Iron & Steel Co., St. Paul; the Northland Oil Co., Willmar; the Barnsdall Refineries, Minneapolis; and the Willhelm Lubrication Co., St. Paul, all of the State of Minnesota, opposing the Federal gasoline tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3038. Also, petition of H. S. Aasen, of Winger; Sam Leverson, of Hawley; F. A. Zejdlik, of East Grand Forks; the Buffalo Oil & Gas Co., A. J. Wentzell, and A. E. Bergland, of Moorhead; the Fruit Service Co., of Duluth; and the Northwest Petroleum Association, Minneapolis, all of the State of Minnesota, opposing tax on gasoline; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3039. By Mr. SPARKS: Petition of 26 citizens of Wallace, Kans., sent in by Mrs. C. A. Hill, of Wallace, Kans., urging Federal supervision of motion pictures; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3040. By Mr. SWICK: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Beaver, Beaver County, Pa., opposing the resubmission of the eighteenth amendment to the State legislatures or conventions for repeal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3041. By Mr. TABER: Petition of Irene Bower, of Atwater, N. Y., and others, urging the enforcement of the eighteenth amendment and opposing any measures for its repeal or modification or resubmission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3042. Also, petition of Alwilda Atwood, of Moravia, N. Y., and others, urging the enforcement of the eighteenth amendment and opposing any measures for its repeal or modification or resubmission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3043. By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Washington, Pa., supporting the eighteenth amendment and protesting against the submission of an amendment to the States repealing the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3044. By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: Petition of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Loveland, Colo., protesting against submission of the eighteenth amendment to the States for a referendum vote and urging sufficient appropriations for enforcement of the prohibition laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3045. By Mr. WATSON: Resolution from Benevolent Council, No. 25, Order of Independent Americans, signed by a number of its members, favoring House Joint Resolution 216; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

3046. Also, petition of residents of Bristol, Pa., favoring the maintenance of the prohibition law and its enforcement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3047. Also, petition signed by members of the faculty of the Hill School, Pottstown, Pa., favoring reductions in appropriations for the War and Navy Departments; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3048. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition of residents of Reese, Mich., protesting against the passage of House bill 8092, or any other compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3049. Also, petition of residents of Cass City, Mich., expressing the desire that military expenditures and appropriations be kept to a minimum; to the Committee on Appropriations.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 29, 1932

(Legislative day of Wednesday, February 24, 1932)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will receive a message from the President of the United States.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. CONNALLY obtained the floor.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to enable me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. FESS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Couzens	Hull	Reed
Austin	Cutting	Johnson	Robinson, Ind.
Bankhead	Dale	Jones	Schall
Barbour	Davis	Kean	Sheppard
Barkley	Dickinson	Kendrick	Shipstead
Bingham	Dill	Keyes	Smith
Black	Fess	King	Smoot
Blaine	Fletcher	La Follette	Steiwer
Borah	Frazier	Lewis	Stephens
Bratton	George	Logan	Thomas, Idaho
Brookhart	Glass	Long	Thomas, Okla.
Broussard	Glenn	McGill	Townsend
Bulkley	Goldsborough	McNary	Trammell
Bulow	Gore	Metcalf	Tydings
Byrnes	Hale	Morrison	Vandenberg
Capper	Harrison	Moses	Wagner
Caraway	Hastings	Neely	Walsh, Mass.
Carey	Hatfield	Norbeck	Walsh, Mont.
Connally	Hawes	Norris	Waterman
Coolidge	Hayden	Nye	Watson
Copeland	Hebert	Oddie	Wheeler
Costigan	Howell	Patterson	White

Mr. JOHNSON. I announce the absence of my colleague the junior Senator from California [Mr. SHORTRIDGE] by reason of continued illness and ask that the announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. GEORGE. I desire to announce that my colleague the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS] is detained from the Senate by illness.

Mr. GLASS. I wish to announce that my colleague the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] is absent in attendance upon the disarmament conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr. HULL. I wish to announce that my colleague the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] has been called away by a death in his family.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 9642) to authorize supplemental appropriations for emergency highway construction, with a view to increasing employment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 268. An act to excuse certain persons from residence upon homestead lands during 1929, 1930, 1931, and 1932 in the drought-stricken areas; and

H. J. Res. 292. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to aid in the establishment of agricultural-credit corporations, and for other purposes.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the approval of the Journal for the calendar days of Wednesday, February 24, Thursday, February 25, and Friday, February 26.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Journal for the three calendar days indicated is approved.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to Senators for the transaction of routine business.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts presented memorials numerous signed by sundry citizens of the State of Massachusetts, remonstrating against the passage of legislation providing for the closing of barber shops on Sunday in the District of Columbia or other restrictive religious measures, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a memorial of 501 citizens of the State of Massachusetts, remonstrating against the proposed imposition of a sales tax on automobiles, trucks, and accessories, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of 140 citizens and sundry organizations in the State of Massachusetts, praying for the passage of the bill (S. 3677) to provide for the establishment of a system of pensions for railroad and transportation employees and for a railroad pension board, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented letters and telegrams in the nature of memorials from 224 citizens of the State of Massachusetts, remonstrating against the imposition of a Federal tax on gasoline, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CAPPER presented a resolution adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Lindsborg, Kans., favoring the passage of legislation providing for the Federal regulation of motor traffic and other instrumentalities of transportation competing with the railroads, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented petitions numerous signed by sundry citizens of the States of Kansas and Colorado, praying for the passage of legislation providing for the Federal regulation of motor bus and truck transportation, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented memorials numerous signed by sundry citizens of Washington, D. C., praying for the passage of legislation providing for regulation of the operation of barber shops on Sunday in the District of Columbia, known as the Copeland Sunday health bill, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Nazarene Sunday School, of Hoxie; the Woman's Foreign Missionary Society of Moreland; the congregations of the Methodist Churches of Hoxie and Goodland; and the congregations of the Baptist and Methodist Churches of Raymond, all in the State of Kansas, protesting against the proposed resubmission of the eighteenth amendment of the Constitution to be ratified by State conventions or legislatures, and favoring the making of adequate appropriations for law enforcement and education in law observance, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. VANDENBERG presented memorials numerous signed by sundry citizens in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the passage of legislation providing for the closing of barber shops on Sunday in the District of Columbia, or other restrictive religious measures, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. BLAINE presented petitions of 102 citizens of the State of Wisconsin, praying for the passage of legislation known as the "farmers' farm relief bill," and also that American agriculture be placed on a basis of equality with other industries, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.